

Over a month's time the slaughterer knows the dressed weight of his beef by grades and the total cost of the live cattle slaughtered to provide that beef. The dressed weight of the beef of each grade is divided by a conversion factor to determine the calculated live weight of the cattle slaughtered to provide that beef. These conversion factors have been certified by O. P. A. and W. F. A. for each grade. They are stated in D. S. C.'s subsidy application blanks. The calculated live weight for each grade of cattle is multiplied by the maximum price of the stabilization range for that grade of cattle. The amounts determined for each grade of cattle are added together to obtain the amount that would have been paid for that particular drove if all the cattle had been bought at the maximum permitted under-the-stabilization range. If the actual cost of the monthly drove exceeds this calculated maximum, the slaughter will be in violation.

Today's action will permit the Price Administrator to issue an order fixing the maximum percentage of Good and Choice cattle that can be slaughtered or delivered by any slaughterer over a month's time. Prior to today's action any slaughterer could elect to kill any percentage of any grade of cattle. A considerable number of slaughterers throughout the country have confined their slaughtering operations primarily to Good and Choice cattle and have killed few or none of the other grades. Since these two grades of cattle have generally tended to sell at or above the maximums of the stabilization range, slaughterers who killed these grades almost exclusively had an average cattle cost higher than that intended under the stabilization program.

Furthermore, these particular slaughterers had available for their customers a much higher percentage of high-quality beef than the average slaughterer in the industry. Today's action permits the Price Administrator to require all slaughterers to kill at least a minimum percentage of other grades of cattle. The percentage of Good and Choice cattle available varies seasonally and the forthcoming O. P. A. order will take this into account. This order will require all slaughterers to participate in the slaughter and distribution of the commoner types of beef and should result in a more equitable distribution of the better grades. Furthermore, this order will require slaughterers to kill a drove including several grades of cattle, which should result in their average costs of cattle staying within the stabilization range.

(Prices, cattle and calves, Office of Economic Stabilization Directive No. 28. Effective January 29, 1945.)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in this connection I invite the attention of Senators to one clause in the release to which I have referred. It reads as follows:

Today's action will permit the Price Administrator to issue an order fixing the maximum percentage of Good and Choice cattle that can be slaughtered or delivered by any slaughterer over a month's time.

In the next paragraph this sentence appears:

Today's action permits the Price Administrator to require all slaughterers to kill at least a minimum percentage of other grades of cattle.

I can see nothing but chaos following such an interpretation of the order, Mr. President, because cattle slaughterers are similar to persons engaged in other lines of business. Each slaughterer has his regular line of trade. He requires certain grades of beef to satisfy his customers, who would not want the other grades at all. If a slaughterer is required to kill a certain percentage of

all the various grades of cattle, nothing but chaos can result.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1945:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harris Walthall, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex., to fill an existing vacancy.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Walter C. Quigley, Mariposa, Calif., in place of D. K. Campbell, resigned.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Wattwood, Titusville, Fla., in place of M. L. Calder, deceased.

GEORGIA

Jesse G. Scaife, Fort Gaines, Ga., in place of R. A. Fowler, transferred.

ILLINOIS

M. Elaine Bryant, Browning, Ill., in place of B. I. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1941.

James C. Stanley, Fairfield, Ill., in place of O. P. Bonner, transferred.

Genevieve B. Livesay, Posen, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KENTUCKY

Verdie Whitmer, Bremen, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Stella Creekmore, Rockholds, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MICHIGAN

Lester Kittell, Riverside, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Richard M. Odegard, Watson, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MONTANA

Alice A. Van Campen, Reedpoint, Mont., in place of S. J. Guthrie, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Gertrude E. White, Melrose, N. Mex., in place of G. E. White. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

NEW YORK

Mabel J. Bigelow, Richville, N. Y., in place of J. M. Reed, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

John S. Chapman, Grifton, N. C., in place of R. B. Mewborn, transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Walter J. Lundy, Forgan, Okla., in place of B. D. Miller, resigned.

OREGON

Lloyd W. Lewis, Nyssa, Oreg., in place of S. D. Goshert, retired.

TENNESSEE

Louise C. Treadway, Pleasant Hill, Tenn., in place of K. N. Suttle, resigned.

TEXAS

Cecil R. Chamberlain, Goree, Tex., in place of L. C. Cowser, removed.

Walter L. Taylor, Morton, Tex., in place of M. N. Winder, retired.

Leta B. Eldson, Stanton, Tex., in place of J. M. Hall, resigned.

George L. Barber, Talco, Tex., in place of F. A. Brown, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, we pray today for every effort which is being made for the diffusion of knowledge, of brotherhood, peace, and good will throughout our country. May there be in us a broader understanding and a conscience that is willing and free to be guided aright. O let the breath of the Gospel of our Master be breathed where men are arrayed against one another, seeking selfish power which exerts itself in divisive ways. May they aim at the true ideal, judging themselves in the sight of a just God; forbid that we should follow the courses which have proven fatal to others. Hold us back from a destructive materialism, from vanity and thoughtlessness, reminding us that these sins produced shame and ruin in every age. Everywhere, dear Lord, allow the world to roll no longer eclipsed; grant that it may be redeemed and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord.

O Good Shepherd, wilt Thou grant Thy blessing especially to all those who are in trouble, to all who are in darkness, to all who are suffering from bereavement, to all who are heartsick, and to all children of sorrow; O bring stars into their nights. Keep from despondency those who are in the midst of life's duties, and may we all seek the right things in the right way, and inspire us with an invincible desire for peace, that man to man may brother be. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DRAFTING OF NURSES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of this House have asked me if I would outline some of the factual background of the present nursing situation, with perhaps some of the pros and cons of a draft of nurses for the Army and Navy at this time. I am most happy to do so, and to this end am asking unanimous consent to spread my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The possible drafting of nurses has been talked of for several years as the only means by which an adequate number could be secured for a very heavy load of casualties, especially over a long period. Many nurses have been hoping for it for some time as the only way for them to obtain release from civilian hospitals and other obligations. Many recruiting committees have hoped for it as the only means to shake certain groups of nurses and certain hospital and civilian groups awake to their responsibilities to the fighting men. To all of these and to many others, the President's call for such a draft, whether there be a universal service act or not, was exceedingly welcome.

In order to recognize adequately the voluntary response of the nursing profession to the need under the conditions existing up to the late fall, it seems to me important as a starting point for our considerations of a possible amendment to the Selective Service Act, or to such a bill as that introduced this week by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that we take cognizance of the fact that out of the 265,000 nurses of the country, 78,000 have already volunteered, 53,000 of whom are in the service today.

Let us not fall into the temptation of considering only the nurses responsible for the present shortage; rather let us inform ourselves of some of the other factors involved. Not the least of these is the fact that we civilians have not recognized our personal responsibility sufficiently. We are not thinking in terms of total-war needs. We are still thinking life is as it used to be. Many people have more money than they have had in a long time, and they are trying to catch up on a lot of their physical ills, flooding the hospitals in consequence. Some of their needs could wait, and I, for one, feel that no one has a right to a hospital bed today unless his need is acute. Whatever could be delayed should be. To the same end, special nurses should be available only to those whose physical need demands constant watchfulness and care; but special nurses should be made available to all who so need them, regardless of ability to pay.

Hospitalization of the acutely sick, on the other hand, helps in the conservation of our depleted community medical personnel, a very real part of the national picture.

The situation in many civilian hospitals due to lack of nurses is acute, but studies have long revealed that salary schedules are generally too low to attract the private-duty nurses into the hospital field, though many married or older nurses are giving part time and so helping to keep the hospital nursing staffs above the danger point. Volunteer nurses' aides, and paid aides, and paid hospital assistants with volunteer orderlies are proving their value everywhere. Here again we civilians have the responsibility of increasing these groups so that qualified nurses can enlist in the armed services.

I do not minimize the difficult situation in which the civilian hospitals find

themselves—but we must find ways to supplement their services and ease their loads. For instance, a certain number of patients could be discharged earlier than they are if the doctors would acquire the habit of referring them to the public health nursing associations, whose nurses, though already heavily loaded, could give them care at home. Care of our civilian population is, of course, a necessary part of our responsibility as citizens. In the field of industry, it might be that such organizations employing less than 500 could make arrangements with local public-health services for part-time work, rather than tying up one or more nurses full time. All these various methods added up together would help carry the load.

One of the deterring factors in nurse recruitment during 1944 has been the action of the War Department in January of 1944 in reducing the 50,000 ceiling on nurses to 40,000, and keeping it on overlong. This action canceled plans for the national registration of nurses and an O. W. I. recruitment campaign that was about to be launched.

The fall gave us the extraordinary phenomena of "the war is over; let us reconvert everything possible to be set for peace." Naturally, nurses shared the general attitude.

With the sudden reverses, of course, one of the first reactions had to be "give us nurses"—10,000 overnight. At once the various agencies involved went to work to get the picture of the need dramatically before the available nurses. I myself wrote a vivid letter of appeal, which was sent out by the National Nursing Council for War Service to at least 25,000 senior cadets and young graduates, as well as to hospital directors and superintendents. To this there has been considerable response. This same National Nursing Council for War Service, Inc., which represents all the national nursing organizations and the nursing services of the Federal Government, together with the Red Cross Recruitment Committee, the Procurement and Assignment Committee, the O. W. I. War Advertising Group, and the Army itself pooled all their efforts and launched a campaign. The fact that they were faced with the holiday season meant that the start would be slow. But the start was made, and I think it is important you should know that the upswing had been felt quite definitely during the week preceding the President's message. You should know also, that the Surgeon General's office did not wait for the President's message to activate its part of the recruitment efforts. Some months ago I consulted with Colonel Yarrow and Major Aynes, who are in charge of the Army part of the program, before speaking on a recruitment program in Times Hall, and I had a long conference with Colonel Blanchfield, Major Aynes, and Miss Blewett of the War Advertising Council during the week preceding the message.

The effect of the message itself has been marked. Reports are coming in from many areas of a flooding of the recruitment offices. This is most heartening as the need for nurses is now, and will continue to be.

There have been complaints from nurses who have applied for Army service that there has been long delay in processing them for actual service, as well as delay in calling them after they have been accepted. Examination of the first complaint discloses that many times a nurse overlooks some item in her application with consequent unavoidable delay to which shortage of personnel in recruitment centers contributes its share. All these difficulties are being looked into and corrected.

Study of the second problem revealed that various corps areas have been slow in recognizing the imperative need and have taken nurses in only once or twice a month. Sometimes 2 months have passed before an accepted nurse has actually been brought in. Both these problems are being taken hold of drastically. However, it is important that everyone, including nurses, should understand that certain very definite and important steps must be taken between the moment of application for service and the moment of complete acceptance for active duty, represented by the taking of oath. Qualifications must be checked, and this cannot be done overnight, nor by unaccustomed personnel. I understand that as envisaged by Selective Service, there would be no change in the groups now being used for classification and accrediting.

You will be interested to know that at a corporation meeting of the National Nursing Council for War Service held in New York City, January 10, the following motions were voted and referred to the American Nurses' Association:

1. Owing to the growing national emergency, the National Nursing Council for War Service approves in principle Federal Selective Service legislation for procurement of nurses to meet the needs of the armed forces.

2. Resolved, That to assure adequate nursing to the civilian population, the National Nursing Council for War Service urges the enactment of a National Service Act to supplement any Selective Service legislation for nurses.

Inasmuch as the Congress created the United States Cadet Nurse Corps 19 months ago to assure a steady flow of students through the training schools of the country, it would seem appropriate for me to summarize the results as of this date.

The Cadet Nurse Corps is a corps of student nurses that serves a twofold purpose: it augments civilian nursing service so that larger numbers of graduate nurses can be released for the military, and it creates a pool from which the military can draw when cadet nurses become seniors and graduates.

The Cadet Nurse Corps is credited by the American Hospital Association with having prevented the collapse of civilian nursing service. Indicative, also, of the vital contribution rendered by student nurses are the following facts: 29 percent of the non-Federal general hospitals have schools of nursing which care for 56 percent of all patients in non-Federal hospitals in the United States; 60 percent of all nursing service in these non-Federal hospitals is given by student nurses. It is particularly interesting to note that 1944 records show a 76 percent increase in student admis-

sions to nursing schools over 1940, the year prior to the first Federal aid to nurse education.

The Army says that 50 senior cadets can release 40 graduate nurses. From April 1944 to December 31, 1944, 1,157 senior cadets have served in Army hospitals and 43.9 percent have indicated their intention to remain as graduate nurses, and 354 senior cadets have served in Navy hospitals, 31.2 percent having indicated their intention to remain as graduate nurses. The Veterans Administration records show that from April through November 1944, 273 senior cadets have served, and approximately 9 percent remained as graduates. The United States Public Health Service records show 104 senior cadets serving and approximately 17 percent of the 46 who graduated have remained as graduate nurses.

In all consideration of the Cadet Corps it must be remembered that it is but 18 months old. Notwithstanding its present accelerated program, it takes 24 to 30 months—a full 3 years—are still necessary in some States—to produce 1 graduate nurse. It must be remembered that most of the 1943-44 graduates were nearing completion of their nursing education when the Corps was formed. Since they had met the bulk of the necessary financial outlay, a very high percentage did not accept Federal scholarships or take the cadet nurse pledge. Therefore it is obvious that the extreme youth of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps accounts for the fact that only a comparatively small number of cadet nurses have been graduated to date. It is important to note, however, that cadet nurses have greatly decreased the burden on graduate nurses in the hospitals, and released great numbers of them for essential service at home and abroad. The growing contributions by the corps to the military, industrial, and civilian nursing is evident by the following statistics showing the estimated number of graduates from the Cadet Corps over the period 1943 through fiscal 1947:

Fiscal year beginning July 1, ending June 30:	
1943-44.....	1,206
1944-45.....	9,165
1945-46.....	25,161
1946-47.....	35,579

¹ Corps members only. Total graduates from schools of nursing, 1944, 28,978.

The United States Cadet Nurse Corps recruitment quota for the 12-month period ending June 30, 1945, is 60,000 new student nurses. Without the Cadet Nurse Corps we should be in serious difficulties in keeping up the supply of nurses for the unpredictable road ahead.

In closing let me give you the nursing figures as of today:

Total nurses in United States of America in 1941.....	265,000
Total nurses volunteered in 1940-44.....	78,000
Total nurses in Army and Navy.....	53,000
Total nurses classified.....	221,000
Classified in:	
Class I-A, single.....	29,676
Class I-B, married.....	13,480
Total.....	42,162
Class I-C (essential until replaced—to be reclassified almost immediately).....	33,348

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the special order of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOESS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the Members that inasmuch as there is no legislative program today or tomorrow, they may insert their extensions at this point if they desire.

HARVARD MERRILL HODGINS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, in response to a letter from a thoughtful, appreciative, and patriotic citizen of my district, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the awarding of an appropriate medal and citation to Harvard Merrill Hodgins, of Hancock Point, Maine, by the Attorney General or the Department of Justice in recognition of the patriotic service rendered by him in connection with the detection in November 1944 of two German spies who had been landed by submarine on the coast of Maine and who were later apprehended by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The letter from Mr. Hanchett reads as follows:

HOLLAND, MICH., January 6, 1945.
Congressman BARTEL JONKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONKMAN: The thought I wish to bring to your attention concerns the 17-year-old Mr. Hodgins, who, when driving home one evening last week, noticed the two German saboteurs plodding through the deep snow and immediately became suspicious of them.

He continued to follow their tracks along the roadside and later on noticed their trail turned off into the dark woods down toward the rocky seashore of the Atlantic. By this time these two suspicious characters had made such a deep impression on this young schoolboy's mind he decided to continue with his check-up on them.

Without seeking the aid or assistance of two or three others, he courageously, single-handed, followed their tracks in the snow until they met the shore line of the ocean, which brought out the fact that said two saboteurs made their way to shore in a rubber boat from a German submarine.

When this young boy started out on this trail into the woods under the cover of a dark night, he did not know if he would walk into a group of heavily armed des-

peradoes or not, who, with little trouble, could have overpowered him and put him to death. But in spite of all the terrible possibilities of what could happen to him, he bravely and courageously continued on his journey.

I have not the ability to picture the brave feat of this young man in a dramatic story, but it is this point of exceeding heroism on his part I wish to bring out.

We all know the results of his quick thinking and action, namely, the capture of these two trained saboteurs that were heavily armed and having on their persons \$60,000. Yes; they could have possibly caused \$60,000,000 worth of destruction, besides the loss of many thousands of lives.

The story ends here, but why am I bringing it to your attention? Well, I feel an outstanding act of bravery of this kind should be acknowledged by some Government agency in a citation of some kind. Brave war soldiers receive their Silver Stars, Purple Hearts, and the like, and some recognition should be given to this boy, whether it be by Congress or some Army officer.

This is merely a thought on my part, so I leave it to you to carry on from here.

Very sincerely yours,

MERRICK W. HANCHETT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a quotation, a letter, and an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

U. N. R. R. A.: MASS COOK'S TOUR

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the letter of T. Titmouse "To the Worthy and Independent Electors of Yatton" appealing for their support of his candidacy for a seat in Parliament should not be overlooked by those who believe in the Act for Giving Everybody Everything. It is a model campaign letter for the champions of largess at the expense of the taxpayers. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the letter of T. Titmouse to the electors of Yatton:

To the Worthy and Independent Electors of Yatton.

GENTLEMEN: His Majesty having been pleased to dissolve the late Parliament, under very remarkable and exciting circumstances, and, in the midst of the transports of enthusiasm arising out of the passing of that second Great Charter of our Liberties, the Act for Giving Everybody Everything, with kindly wisdom, to call upon you to exercise immediately the high and glorious privilege of choosing your representative in the new Parliament, I beg leave to announce myself as a candidate for that distinguished honor. Gentlemen, long before I succeeded in establishing my right to reside among you in my present capacity, I felt a deep interest in the welfare of the tenants of the property, and especially of those residing in the parts adjacent, and who are now so happily introduced into the constituency of this ancient and loyal borough. I trust that the circumstance of my ancestors having resided for ages within it will not indispose you to a favorable reception of their descendant and representative.

Gentlemen, my political opinions are those which led to the passing of the great measure I have alluded to and which are bound up in it. Without going into details, which are too multifarious for the limits of such an address as the present, let me assure

you that, though firmly resolved to uphold the agricultural interests of this great country, I am equally anxious to sustain the commercial and manufacturing interests; and whenever they are unhappily in fatal conflict with each other, I shall be found at my post, zealously supporting both, to the utmost of my ability. Though a sincere and firm member and friend of the established church, I am not insensible to the fearful abuses which at present prevail in it, particularly in its revenues, which I am disposed to lessen and equalize, devoting the surplus capital to useful purposes connected with the state, from which she derived them, as history testifies. I am bent upon securing the utmost possible latitude to every species of dissent. In fact, I greatly doubt whether any form of religion ought to be established in a free country.

While I am resolved to uphold the interests of Protestantism, I think I best do so by seeking to remove all restrictions from the Catholics, who, I am persuaded, will sacredly abstain from endeavoring to promote their own interests at the expense of ours. The infallible page of history establishes their humility, meekness, and moderation. Gentlemen, depend upon it, the established religion is most likely to flourish when surrounded by danger and threatened by persecution; it has an inherent vitality which will defy, in the long run, all competition. Gentlemen, I am for peace, retrenchment, and reform, which are in fact the three polar stars of my political conduct. I am an advocate for quarterly Parliaments, convinced that we can not too often be summoned to give an account of our stewardship and that the frequency of elections will occasion a wholesale agitation and stimulus to trade. I am for extending the elective franchise to all, except those who are actually the inmates of a prison or a poorhouse on the day of election; and for affording to electors the inviolable secrecy and protection of the ballot. I am an uncompromising advocate of civil and religious liberty all over the globe; and, in short, of giving the greatest happiness to the greatest number. Gentlemen, before concluding, I wish to state explicitly, as the result of long and deep inquiry and reflection, that I am of opinion that every constituency is entitled, nay, bound, to exact from a candidate for its suffrages the most strict and minute pledges as to his future conduct in Parliament in every matter, great or small, that can come before it; in order to prevent his judgment being influenced and warped by the dangerous sophistries and fallacies which are broached in Parliament and protect his integrity from the base, sinister, and corrupt influences which are invariably brought to bear on public men. I am ready, therefore, to pledge myself to anything that may be required of me by any elector who may honor me with his support. Gentlemen, such are my political principles, and I humbly hope that they will prove to be those of the electors of this ancient and loyal borough, so as to warrant the legislature in having preserved it in existence amidst the wholesale havoc which it has just made in property of this description. Though it is not probable that we shall be harassed by a contest, I shall make a point of waiting upon you all personally and humbly answering all questions that may be put to me; and should I be returned, rely upon it that I will never give you occasion to regret your display of so signal an evidence of your confidence in me. I have the honor to be, gentlemen, your most obedient and humble servant.

T. TITMOUSE.

YATTON, December 3, 18—.

Mr. Speaker, under further leave to extend my remarks, I am also inserting a news article in reference to U. N. R. R. A. which appears in the Times-Herald under date of January 10, 1945, as follows:

**"NOTHING TO DO," REASON BRITON QUIT
U. N. R. R. A.**

LONDON, January 10.—The Daily Express today quoted H. Vernon Lindsay, London businessman, as saying that he resigned his United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration job in October because he had nothing to do but watch the taxpayers' money being wasted.

Lindsay, who, according to the article, joined U. N. R. R. A. 4 days after D-day at a salary of \$4,500 a year plus almost \$8 daily living expenses, a total of about \$8,000 a year, was quoted as saying:

"I worked for 10 days in the U. N. R. R. A. London office in Portland Place and found a large surplus of staff doing practically nothing. I was posted [assigned] to Cairo and flown there. I found a staff of from 300 to 400, 60 percent of them Americans and the rest British or drawn from other United Nations.

"MASS COOK'S TOUR

"Many officials and their wives with them, also in jobs and drawing pay and living allowances. The U. N. R. R. A. in Cairo is under dual control of Washington and London and there seemed to be no real head to determine policy or decide on action.

"I met several 1,000-pound (\$4,000) per year men who had come out from London only to find the posts had already been filled by Washington, so they had to wait around doing nothing until something was found for them. To me it seemed to be a mass Cook's tour at the taxpayers' expense."

A U. N. R. R. A. official in London, commenting on Lindsay's statement, said Lindsay was careless about his facts. There is no dual control in Cairo, the official said, adding that it was directly responsible to Washington.

Since London is the mobilization center for personnel and transportation is irregular, he said, there are temporary surpluses of staff. He attributed Lindsay's resignation to a disinclination to take a position in which he was subordinate to officials younger than himself.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and include therein a statement from the Okonite Co., of Passaic, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, emphasizing what American business faces today in answering the multitude of Government directives issued from day to day, I present defense memorandum No. 45, dated December 19, 1944, and prepared by Mr. Donald R. Stevens, vice president of the Okonite Co., of Passaic, N. J., in my congressional district.

This company, which manufactures insulated wires, cables, and splicing tapes, reports that 20 additional Government directives, and so forth, were received during the month of November, bringing the total since Pearl Harbor to 908. The memorandum reads as follows:

DEFENSE MEMORANDUM NO. 45, DECEMBER 19, 1944

Twenty additional Government directives, etc., were received for the month of November, bringing the total since Pearl Harbor up to 908.

889, August 19, W. P. B.: Specific request from Donald Nelson on the subject of eye-sight and visual conditions among industrial workers. We should study the manual which

accompanies the letter; we should ask an appropriate officer in our organization to check out a substantial questionnaire. We do not comply. This is more bureaucratic boloney. Compare 832, 722, 389, 369, etc. Medical people are continually trying to federalize everything in the line of health.

890, September, Office of War Information: An eight-page document entitled "Cut-Back Field Guide," giving very complete and specific detailed instructions on how to advise our labor in case we have any cut-backs. We have already had cut-backs and we don't need any of this advice. Compare 874, 876, 829, etc.

891, November 2, I. N. M., Navy, New York: Instructions that excessive overruns in the line of excess materials will be refused by inspectors. Compare 867. We do not have excess overruns.

892, November 3, Second Service Command: Official advice that Okonite, Passaic, has finally been deleted from the responsibility list of Second Service Command. "Plant security measures * * * should be continued as your responsibility." We comply. This is a case of off again, on again, off again. Compare 881.

893, November 3, Ordnance, New York: Request to send 20 representatives to a forum on American Small Arms, including film. We do not comply. Compare 883 and 869.

894, November 3, Navy, I. N. M., New York: Request for advance information concerning anticipated lay-off of large groups of workers account cut-backs. None to date. Will comply. Compare 890, 880, and 879.

895, November 7, Army Air Forces, New York: Full production should be maintained at all war plants on Thanksgiving Day. Christmas is the only day on which to interrupt schedules. We complied at Paterson and Wilkes-Barre. We did not comply at Passaic account Navy cutback. Compare 903, 896, 876, and 829.

896, November 9, Chief Signal Officer, Washington, D. C.: Telegram to observe full working schedule on Thanksgiving Day. We comply. Compare 903, 895, 876, and 829.

897, November 10, Navy Industrial Incentive Division, Washington, D. C.: Suggestion that we should use motion-picture films to promote morale. We do not comply. Compare 906, 900, 864, 843, 838, and 836.

898, November 14, Philadelphia Signal Corps: Advice to protect facilities and avoid sabotage on VE-day. Comment: This war is not yet won. Compare 876, 874, and 829.

899, November 14, Newark Defense Council: Invitation to attend performance of The Forgotten Factor, an industrial drama for national teamwork. We did not comply. Compare 883, 898, etc.

900, November 16, United States Army District Chief, New York, General Reimel: Request to notify all employees that General Eisenhower will speak from European headquarters on November 19 at 3:30 p. m. account Army's urgent need for more supplies. We posted all plants. Compare 906, 864, 843, 838, and 836.

901, November 17, War Manpower Commission and War Mobilization and Reconversion: Suggestion that it may be necessary to rescind authorization for resuming civilian production in groups 1 and 2 labor market areas, account of critical manpower shortage. Compare 874.

902, November 17, United States Engineer, New York: More about working Thanksgiving Day. Compare 903, 876, 829, and 893.

903, November 17, Navy, Inspector of Naval Material, New York: More about working Thanksgiving Day. Compare, 902, 896, 876, 929, etc.

904, November 21, War contracts termination: Questionnaire referred to treasurer, Mr. Metz. Compare 876, 874, and 890.

905, November 21, Signal Corps Regional Labor Office, New York, and National War Labor Board: Advice that year-end bonuses up to \$25 may be paid without obtaining permission of War Labor Board; other instructions on bonus plans. This is very untimely and approaches the political. We pay a large established monthly bonus which was in effect long before the Wage Ceiling Act went into effect. Nevertheless this release to the newspapers brought our employees into conference with us—they asking for an extra \$25 which we denied. Compare 267, 223, and 222.

906, November 26, War Department, Chief Signal Officer, Washington: Request to increase production if humanly possible. This is one of the few documents in our whole collection from Washington that is interested in production. Compare 864, 843, 838, and 836.

907, November 27, Philadelphia, Signal Corps: Reports of equipment being received in theaters of operation in damaged condition due to inadequate packaging. Circulated to our three plant shipping departments and Signal Corps inspection forces. We are complying with Signal Corps specifications to the satisfaction of their inspectors. Compare 873.

908, November 30, Department of Commerce, Business Advisory Council: Policies on veteran reemployment. The committee forwarded three comprehensive programs; namely, Swift & Co., International Harvester, and Westinghouse. These programs in my opinion are entirely too formal and too complicated for us. They are, however, a very thorough job and will be retained in the works manager's file for reference if necessary. They cover everything that the veteran is entitled to on the G. I. bill of rights, rehabilitation, insurance, vacation policies, etc. They are an effort to make the veteran welcome home. We are writing an individual letter to each employee on this same subject—welcome home—whenever he comes back to work. We have also sent letters to all employees in the armed services asking them whether they intend to come back to us and telling them that they will be welcome.

THE OKONITE CO.,
D. R. STEVENS, Vice President.

PASSAIC, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of a secretary of national health.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, coming to the desks of Members of Congress, if they request it, is the Surplus Reporter. This reporter lists the surplus goods being sold by the United States Treasury Department. It is rather confusing when one reads the many pages of this reporter and notes that the hundreds of thousands of articles listed for sale as surplus when, in

fact, many of the factories making this type of goods are crying for help.

I note in this morning's paper that the crucial developments in the western front brought forth an announcement by the Red Cross that additional surgical gauze is being shipped to the Red Cross chapters to fill the urgent requests of the Surgeon General of the Army for 43,000,000 surgical dressings. The Surplus Reporter lists, on page 34 of the January 6 issue, 27,000,000 packages of gauze at Louisville, Ky., which they are trying to sell. There is an additional 1,700,000 individually wrapped packages at Pueblo, Colo. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be some very loose and haphazard planning when one department of the Government is desperately trying to sell surplus property which another department is urging a speed-up to produce.

The Surplus Reporter on one page lists 121,000 new hospital mattresses for sale. There are tens of thousands of items like syringes, needles, sulfa and other drugs listed as surplus. One item is 200,000 tubes of catgut. I know the factories of the country are working 24 hours a day trying to produce the same things that are here selling in the surplus.

I refer only to hospital items because I am familiar with this field. We also find in these reports thousands upon thousands of other new and used items which, undoubtedly, will find their way into the familiar Army and Navy stores tomorrow. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it makes one wonder just how good Government planning can be. Does it not mean that when there is a surplus, whether it is 22,000,000 flashlight batteries or 27,000,000 packages of surgical gauze, that someone made a mistake? Does it not also follow that if there is a surplus of the property that the factories ought not to be making the same thing which is being sold by another department of Government as surplus?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore agreed to for today I may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

LT. GEN. GEORGE PATTON

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. George Patton has furnished to the Army brilliant military leadership. He has been the victor in many an engagement against the Germans. In Africa, Sicily, in Normandy, and in the Ardennes Forest the enemy has felt the full force of his knock-out punches. I propose that he be made a four-star general. He is entitled to this recognition and to increased authority.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I think all Members of Congress will agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD two very brilliant editorials, one from the Shreveport Journal, dated December 30, entitled "Patton to the Rescue," the other from the Shreveport Times, dated December 31, 1944, entitled "Patton Should Have Four Stars."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Shreveport Journal of December 30, 1944]

PATTON TO THE RESCUE

It was Gen. George S. Patton's Third Army which first broke Germany's west wall and startled the world by its record-breaking dash across Europe to the Saar Basin. Last week "Old Blood and Guts" Patton was again called to the aid of our First Army—at a time when the Germans had, by a surprise counter-offensive, driven a 40-mile wedge through its lines. Leaving his own front to its own devices, General Patton drove 22 miles in 6 days, rescuing American units besieged in the town of Bastogne, and reached on Thursday a point only 17 miles from the First Army line.

The effect of this Third Army lunge was electric. As a result, Von Rundstedt's German divisions were halted and his entire force is today in grave danger of being trapped in the Belgian bulge. They had driven three prongs into Luxemburg and Belgium, the deepest of these being approximately 40 miles, compelling General Hodges' First American Army to fall back steadily over a long front from the Aachen area to the Luxemburg-France boundary line; the retreat could not be stopped until the Third Army swung into action from the south, with the rough and tough pistol-packin' Patton in command.

It may be a little too early to say that Von Rundstedt's gamble has lost, but there can be no question that his headlong plunge has been checked and that the Nazis have been forced to go back to defensive war instead of an offensive. Nor that it was General Patton's brilliant rescue strategy that did the trick.

[From the Shreveport Times of December 31, 1944]

PATTON SHOULD HAVE FOUR STARS

If there is any man who deserves promotion in the United States Army to the rank of four-star general, it is three-star Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr.

In five critical and tragic moments in this war, Patton has stood forth as strategist, tactician, and leader of men to victory against odds that often seemed overwhelming. He has had a larger number of really tough field campaigns than any of our generals, with the possible exception of five-star MacArthur, and has smashed his way to victory for his men, his country, and himself every time.

In the invasion of north Africa Patton was given the one truly tough task—invasion from sea, with armored forces, of Casablanca, where resistance was sure to be great, where tides were so rough and tricky that

only for a few hours each day could men or equipment be put ashore to overcome powerful and fixed defenses. He did the job, magnificently, commanding both Army and Navy invasion forces. His tactics have been cited by Army men as saving thousands of American lives in that combat.

When Rommel tore up an American Army Corps at Kasserine Pass, Patton was called to stem the German onslaught. He did it, rallied faltering troops, reorganized them, and pointed the way to final victory in Africa.

In Sicily he completed conquest of the island in 39 days when all experts expected at least 90 to 100 days to be consumed. He did it by magnificent strategy and tactics, despite the flop of the British Eighth Army in a critical stage of the campaign. He organized the Army that carried out this invasion, planned the strategy, directed the tactics.

After the invasion of northern Europe, his Third American Army made a drive from Normandy to Paris that still has tacticians gasping at its speed and efficiency. With hardly a breath of time for reorganization he led this same army in an equally spectacular drive to the German border. This drive was stopped not by the enemy, but by inability of those in the rear to keep Patton's forces supplied with gasoline for his vehicles and ammunition for his guns. If he had been given both, no one knows where he might have gone.

And now, in the past 2 weeks, when the Germans ripped through the American First Army and drove to the shores of the Meuse and almost within shelling distance of Sedan, it was Patton and his Third Army again that saved the day with a magnificent drive of 22 miles into the tough side of the seemingly invincible German forces. There's no telling where that Nazi break-through would be today but for Patton and the Third Army.

Retired Gen. Peyton C. March, World War No. 1 chief of staff, bluntly charged a few days ago that the American and Allied high commands in Europe had failed to punch the enemy on the nose when real slugging might have been decisive. Patton always has punched the enemy on the nose—with both fists, regardless of the opposing odds, with no quarter asked and none given. It is worthy of thought that in every campaign from Africa to the German border, except one, the American forces have met at least one tragic and unexpected debacle at the hands of a supposedly routed enemy. The one exception was Patton's campaign in Sicily, which military experts say will be a basis of our military textbooks of the future.

General Patton merited four stars long ago. Just about everyone in the Army knows that he would have had them but for the wild, exaggerated, overplayed and partly false versions given to the utterly unimportant incident when he followed a rather well-established and recognized course of slapping a soldier, in Sicily, in an effort to see if he was really battle-fatigued or just "dogging it."

The United States has many fine generals from one-star to five-star. Perhaps many of them are fully comparable in leadership, strategic ability, and tactical ability, to Patton. However, it would be hard to find any, unless it be MacArthur, who has done more under tougher conditions. He deserves four stars—and more.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the great record of the Fifty-sixth Fighter Group, Eighth Air Force, and to include therein two Associated Press dispatches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered on Monday next I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a news item taken from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

IS IT NECESSARY TO DRAFT MORE FARM LABOR INTO THE MILITARY SERVICE?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with the war in its present critical stage, I regret that I am impelled to make the following remarks. No one likes to oppose the policies of those high in authority under present conditions, but we Members of Congress have our duty to perform and we should not shirk from our responsibilities, however unpleasant the task.

Mr. Speaker, today for a few minutes I want to address my remarks to the recent directive of the War Mobilization Director, Mr. James Byrnes, and to his policies that are about to be carried out by the Selective Service Director, General Hershey. I want to point out some of the dangers and question the wisdom of taking many more young farm hands off of the farms and ask the question, "Is it absolutely necessary?" I think those who are directing this move are making a serious mistake. I believe men can be found in necessary numbers for the Army without further depleting the farm manpower of the Nation.

Before the Tydings amendment was passed, farm labor had no protection and was pretty well depleted. The Congress, recognizing the necessity of keeping up food production to feed the Army, our people, and for lend-lease, sought to stop inroads on farm labor by passing the Tydings amendment.

This latest move, whether so intended, will, in a large degree, bypass the protection against the drafting of farm labor and unless the Congress, representing the people, calls a halt and does it quickly, farm labor will be depleted to the point where with a crop failure coming upon us through unfavorable seasons, we are likely to be faced with a very dangerous shortage of food in this country. This Nation must produce the

tremendous amount of food necessary to sustain the Army, our civilian population, its outgo for lend-lease, and we are committed to the other nations helping to fight this war to furnish the greater amount of the food that is necessary to keep the people from starvation in those countries where the forces of the United Nations drive the enemy out. By this commitment, during the coming year, there will be a demand for more food than we have needed during any year since the war began.

It has been suggested by Director Byrnes and War Food Administrator Jones, and endorsed by the President, that this further inroad on the drafting of young men between the ages of 18 and 26 from the farms can be done without endangering our agricultural production, urging that older men can replace these younger men drawn from the farms.

These statements are in error. The Congressman coming from his district and who represents his district is closer to the people than those just named. He is in the best position to know whether or not these statements are correct. I have talked with at least 30 Congressmen representing agricultural districts, every one of whom insist that the manpower shortage is such on the farms that no more men can be spared, that there are no replacements for such men if they are taken into the service. During the harvest time last fall you could drive through any agricultural district and see old men, women, girls, and children helping in the harvest fields throughout the length and breadth of this country, working unthinkable hours in an attempt to harvest the crops that had been the result of months of toil. You cannot go into any agricultural section in these United States and make a survey without being convinced that the farmers have been bled white for help and that it would be a tragedy to take more of their manpower away from them with the commitments this Government has to produce the necessary amount of food to win this war, continue lend-lease, and to keep starvation away from the countries after we drive the enemy out.

The shelves of the grocers in the big cities, whose citizens think they are not interested so acutely in the farm problem, will find a shortage of food, and the pinch will come in such metropolitan centers as New York, Chicago, and the other big cities, if the Congress is unable to stop this most dangerous move that is about to be launched, further depleting of the farm manpower of this country.

Adding to the danger of this situation is the fact that the farm machinery and farm tools used by the farmers and needed for farm production in many instances have been worn out and new machinery cannot be had. The Government has urged the necessity of large farm production to win the war. It finds now that there will be less farm machinery available to the farmers in 1945 than was available in 1944, according to a statement of the International Harvester Co., which will make his work more difficult, and now the

Government says we must take thousands of the young men, who are working long hours on the farms, away from the farms into the military service, at a time when farm help is so scarce that boys and girls from 10 to 15 years of age and the wives of the farmers, in many instances, are compelled to drive the tractors and power-driven machinery throughout this country to till their farms and produce the food that the Government says it must have.

Of course, the winning of the war is the first concern of all of us. We must have the necessary production of munitions and men for military service and we can have them without taking such a terrible gamble with agriculture in the production of food.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD in a statement not long ago, after an exhaustive investigation, said that his committee found there were 500,000 people on the Federal pay rolls who were not needed. Would it not be wise to get all of the men qualified for military service between 18 and 26 out of this group before further disturbing farm production? And, this is only a small group. For years now, the War Manpower Commission has used its power to drive men into the war plants of this country by the threat of taking those who are physically fit into military service. In nearly every war plant in the Nation there are more men employed than are necessary. The greatest waste of manpower and the greatest hoarding of manpower at the present time is in the various war plants of the Nation where, in many instances, two or three men are employed where one man would do the work more efficiently.

You can talk to the men you know who have worked in the war plants of this country and many of them will tell you that, through cost-plus and the connivance of the contractors, in a great many instances men are idling and wasting their time yet drawing big wages from the Government.

Cannot something be done to relieve the congestion in war plants of men who are not needed, taking into the military service those of the proper age and physical qualifications and turning back into civilian life the doubtless hundreds of thousands who could be spared from these plants without reducing their production in any way? Something should be done along this line to reduce the expense in our war effort and to get this great reservoir of hoarded labor in these plants back into active and useful production.

There is a danger that the local draft boards, under the pressure of the State Directors of Selective Service, will not give the farm workers their full protection under the Tydings amendment, which is the law of the land and the direct expression of the will of the Members of Congress.

If undue pressure is being applied to the point where it is bypassing the will of Congress by any of the heads of Selective Service in the States or here in Washington it should be stopped. We cannot meet this manpower shortage without facing the facts. The place to get this additional manpower is not on the farms but is in the factories of the

Nation where the hoarding is going on. And in addition let me point out that there are 3,000,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 26 in Belgium and in France who are already over there, obviating the necessity of shipping them across, who are not in the military service and who, in my judgment, in large numbers should and could be utilized in the service to fight for their country now after we traveled thousands of miles to liberate such countries.

In my candid judgment it is time for the Members of Congress to give the most serious consideration and to voice our sentiments for a further search for manpower before more men are taken from the farms who are actually producing in a substantial manner the food that this Nation, our allies, and the liberated countries and our soldiers must have.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune, of La Crosse, Wis., entitled "Mr. President and Congress, Speak Up."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been a vast amount of talk in executive circles about man shortage. This has been especially true since recent events on the western front. It is proposed now to take the men classed as II-C's, many of whom are the last hope of the farmers engaged in the production of food for the Army and Navy and the liberated people abroad. It is not necessary to comb the farms further for labor. It will bring disaster to our food-production program to do so.

The real reservoir of labor is in those industries where labor has been hoarded.

Throughout many industrial plants men are so numerous that they actually interfere with production. Two and three men are hired to do the work of one man.

One outstanding businessman who has made an investigation of labor hoarding insists that 25 percent of the employees could be dropped from the pay rolls of many war industries without adversely curtailing production.

To quote the exact language of this large employer of labor:

I am honestly convinced that if a thorough and impartial survey were made of the

larger industries throughout the country by men who are competent to judge, you would find that at least 25 percent of the employees could be dropped from their rolls without adversely affecting production, and in fact the weeding out of these employees who are excess baggage would undoubtedly result in greater efficiency, and by reason thereof an increase in production.

Mr. Speaker, the farms have been stripped of help, notwithstanding that the Tydings amendment is still the law and as such should be observed in fact and in spirit as was intended by Congress when it passed the amendment as part of the Selective Service Act. I quote from the amendment as it applies to the men classed as II-C:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

I admit that the temptation of large industries to hoard labor is because the excess-profits-tax law invites large pay rolls. It furnishes a means of avoiding falling within the excess-profits provision which in some cases relieves the labor-hoarding industries from a 95 percent tax. It is unjust and dangerous to strip the farms of labor, as is now proposed, thus curtailing the food supply, instead of drawing upon the excess labor supply not needed in many large cost-plus war industries.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 11, 1945.

[Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the Seventy-fifth and Seventy-sixth Congresses, serving in the House of Representatives for 4 years from 1937 to 1940, inclusive.

I hold in my hand page 7 of the issue of the San Francisco Chronicle of Monday, October 30, 1944, which contains a political advertisement headed, as follows:

Would you trust your post-war future in these hands?—Investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States—(Hearing) Tuesday, July 16, 1940—House of Representatives Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Beaumont, Tex.—Excerpts from sworn testimony of John L. Leech, former member, State committee, Communist Party of California and candidate for Congress on the Communist Party ticket in 1936 from the Seventeenth California Congressional District.

I now quote from the advertisement:

Question. Do you know the present Member of Congress from San Francisco—Mr. FRANK HAVENNER?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Does he have any connection with the Communist Party?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you ever meet him in a meeting where no one else was present except Communists?

Answer. Yes.

Question. You stated you had met with Mr. HAVENNER in a fraction meeting of the Communist Party?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. Was that fraction meeting held in San Francisco?

Answer. Now excuse me; I would like to make a correction for the record. I did not mean to say, if I did, that I had met him in a fraction meeting. I had met him in a State executive committee meeting.

Question. Was Mr. HAVENNER a member of the State executive committee of the Communist Party?

Answer. No.

Question. What was he doing at this State executive committee meeting?

Answer. To the best of my recollection this was a discussion—and it is not necessary that a person be a member of the State executive committee or the State committee, to be called in for assistance, or directions of the State executive committee.

Question. Could he have attended this meeting if he had not been a member of the Communist Party?

Answer. No; I have never known of a case, and I don't believe such a connection has ever taken place where a nonmember could meet with a leading body of the party.

Question. Now, in addition to this meeting you have already discussed, you stated you met with him on other occasions?

Answer. Yes; informally, in left-wing affairs. In other words he participated in af-

fairs organized by the Communist Party or left-wing organization under the domination of the Communist Party.

Question. And at this time he was a Member of Congress?

Answer. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this political advertisement in San Francisco last October, I knew nothing about this meeting of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities which the advertisement alleged was held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940. Naturally, I immediately inquired whether such a meeting had actually been held.

I am informed that representatives of the press who went to the office of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities were furnished with a printed volume entitled, "Investigation of Un-American Propaganda in the United States," which contained a report of a meeting of a subcommittee held in Beaumont, Tex., on the date mentioned. It was marked "Executive session" and showed as present, Hon. Martin Dies, chairman, Robert E. Stripling, secretary of the committee, and James H. Stedman, investigator.

In this printed volume appeared all of the questions and answers which were contained in the political advertisement which I have just read, together with other questions and answers relating to me, as follows:

Question. When did you first meet Mr. HAVENNER, Mr. Leech?

Answer. I have been several times with him, Mr. Stedman. However, some of the times were simply at left-wing gatherings, and I am afraid, to be completely accurate, I could not even place the dates.

Question. But you have met him on a number of occasions?

Answer. Yes, sir; I have met him on a number of occasions.

Question. Did Mr. HAVENNER ever join the Communist Party?

Answer. I have never seen an application card or any documentary proof as to that. It is my understanding, on the basis of his participation in party activity, that he has been and is at the present time a member of the Communist Party. But again I say, I have at no time ever seen documentary proof of this.

Question. You have met him in strictly Communist Party meetings?

Answer. On one occasion that I remember.

Question. Would you please state what that occasion was, Mr. Leech?

Answer. That is a very serious question. I am afraid of my accuracy not on the basic facts—but I am afraid of my accuracy on it.

Question. Could you give us the approximate year when this meeting occurred?

Answer. Well, this meeting occurred some time during the course of 1936. Again I think it was in preparation for the State criminal syndicalism congress.

Question. Did Mr. HAVENNER take an active part in that conference?

Answer. In the discussion—he was not, to the best of my recollection, at the conference but he took an active part in the discussion and preparation and the outlining of this conference.

Question. Do you know what he was doing at that time?

Answer. I think he was connected in some way with the first California writers' project. I do know he worked and associated with Harry Carlyle, who was a member of the Communist Party, and he was the organizer of the first California State writers' project. But all of my party work was in the Los

Angeles area and Mr. HAVENNER lived in San Francisco, and I will have to say that my recollection of details is vague here.

Question. But you do know Mr. HAVENNER cooperated with the party?

Answer. I do know that to be a fact; yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of this meeting of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities at Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, I was a Member of the House of Representatives and had been for 3½ years next preceding that date. I had never received any notice of this hearing prior to the time it was held and have never received any notice of the hearing from the Special Committee on Un-American Activities or from any other person up to the present time. The first knowledge I had that such a subcommittee meeting was held was more than 4 years later when I read in this political advertisement printed in several San Francisco daily newspapers during the months of October and November 1944 excerpts from the testimony given by witness Leech which I have just read to the Members of the House. I have never been given an opportunity to appear before that committee to face my accuser or to reply to his testimony.

Mr. Speaker, the name "Communist" has been used by the Dies committee from its very inception as a symbol of subversive and un-American beliefs and practices, and membership in the Communist Party has been construed by the committee as proof that the individual holding such membership was an advocate of the use of force and violence to overthrow the Government of this country. Therefore, when this witness was permitted to testify that I was a member of the Communist Party he was in effect indicting me for subversive and un-American beliefs and practices, and charging that I was an advocate of the use of force and violence to overthrow our Government.

If the chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities believed that this sworn testimony was true it was his duty to report it to the House of Representatives and recommend that I be brought before the bar of the House and expelled. If there was any doubt in his mind as to the truth of this testimony, it certainly was his duty to notify me and call me before his committee to disprove the testimony, if I could.

But, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities did neither of those things. He did not even notify all of the other members of his special committee that this damaging testimony had been given against a Member of Congress. Instead, the record of this secret meeting held down in Beaumont, Tex., was pigeonholed for more than 4 years, when suddenly and mysteriously, it was made available for use against me in a political campaign.

Mr. Speaker, the sworn testimony of witness Leech in this printed report is false in its entirety and constitutes perjury of the most vicious and malicious type. I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party, nor have I ever had any connections or as-

sociations with that party or its activities in any manner whatever. I do not subscribe and never have subscribed to the platform or the program of the Communist Party. I am now and always have been a devout believer in and supporter of the fundamental principles and institutions upon which the American Government is founded. The idea of the employment of force and violence to overthrow the Government which I love is as hateful to me as it possibly could be to any other true American citizen. Indeed the only time when I could possibly advocate the use of violent force with relation to our Government would be in defense of its fundamental principles and institutions. For nearly 20 years I have been a public official in America, sworn to uphold and protect our Constitution and our form of government, and no man in all those years, except in the instance to which I am now addressing myself, has ever accused me of being false to that high trust.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the record and my own reputation, I desire to deal with the testimony of witness Leech item by item. The witness testified that he knew me and that he had been with me several times at what he described as left-wing gatherings, although he admitted he could not fix the dates.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the witness, Leech, and to the best of my knowledge and belief have never met him. If I ever did meet him I did not know who he was. The statement that he has met me on a number of occasions is absolutely false.

In response to a question whether I had ever joined the Communist Party, the witness, Leech, replied:

I have never seen an application card or documentary proof as to that. It is my understanding on the basis of his participation in party activity, that he has been and is at the present time a member of the Communist Party. But again I say I have at no time seen any documentary proof of this.

The only part of this statement which is true is that the witness had never seen any documentary proof that I was a member of the Communist Party. His statement that it was his understanding, "on the basis of my participation in party activity," that I had been and was at that time a member of the Communist Party is a deliberate lie. I have never participated in Communist Party activity, and the witness never could have had any understanding, based on such a premise, that I was a member of the Communist Party.

In response to other leading questions, the witness, Leech, testified that he had met me in meetings which were attended only by Communists but refused to state the occasions or the dates. The statement that he ever met me at any such gathering was a deliberate and malicious lie, because I have never attended any such meetings.

The witness, Leech, finally testified that one of these meetings occurred sometime in 1936, in preparation for the State Criminal Syndicalism Congress. This statement was another deliberate lie, because I never had anything to do with the State Criminal Syndicalism Congress nor attended any meetings in preparation for it.

The witness testified that I took an active part in the discussion and preparation and outlining of this congress. This statement was equally as false as any of his preceding statements.

The witness, Leech, testified that he met me in a State executive meeting of the Communist Party and that I could not have attended this meeting if I had not been a member of the Communist Party. This was merely another malicious lie by the witness, as I have never attended any such meeting. The witness fixed the date of this meeting as sometime in 1936 and testified that at that time I was a Member of Congress. This was probably the only unintentional falsehood which he uttered during this testimony, because I was not a Member of Congress in 1936. At that time I was an elected member and president of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

The witness testified that at the time of this meeting I was connected in some way with the first California writers' project, and that I worked with and associated with a man named Harry Carlyle, a member of the Communist Party and organizer of the writers' project. I had no connection with the California writers' project. I do not know Harry Carlyle, and did not work with him or associate with him, and this statement is as false and malicious as any other statements made by witness Leech.

The witness, Leech, testified that he knew that I cooperated with the Communist Party. He could not have known anything of the kind, because I never cooperated with the Communist Party in any way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time of the House, not so much to defend my own reputation against this malicious perjury, because I am proud to say that my reputation needs no defense before many thousands of patriotic Americans in my district in California, but because of the outrageous and un-American treatment to which a Member of this and previous Congresses has been subjected by this so-called Committee on Un-American Activities. I know, as a result of conversations with various members of the Dies committee, that few members if any, other than the chairman, knew any more than I did of the star-chamber meeting of the subcommittee at which this perjured testimony was given. I personally know of no other instance in all of the history of the Congress of the United States when a secret meeting of a committee of the Congress was held for the purpose of receiving defamatory testimony concerning a Member of the Congress without permitting that Member to have any knowledge of the meeting or any opportunity to appear and testify in his own defense. Surely such a proceeding violated all of the ethical precedents of this democratic body and constituted a glaring and flagrant illustration of the very kind of un-American activities which this committee was set up to prevent.

Even if the charges made against me had been true—instead of being false in their entirety—I was entitled to be informed of the accusations and to be given an opportunity to confront my accuser.

But, Mr. Speaker, this smear attack was permitted and I was not notified or given any opportunity to appear in my own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, witnesses like Leech do not appear by mere accident at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in a place remote from the Capitol of the United States to attack the reputation of a Member of Congress who is at his post of duty at the Capitol. Someone brought this witness, Leech, to that secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., by prearrangement, and whoever brought him there was undoubtedly thoroughly familiar with the testimony he was prepared to give. And if his testimony concerning me was, as I now solemnly assure the House, perjured in its entirety, then someone was guilty of subornation of perjury.

The circumstances surrounding the ultimate release of this perjured testimony for publication as a paid political advertisement during the recent congressional campaign are as mysterious and surreptitious as the conduct of the subcommittee meeting down in Beaumont, Tex., when this perjury was permitted to be perpetrated. I do not know and have not been able to ascertain the identity of the person or persons to whom this perjured testimony was first released, after it had been kept secret from public scrutiny for more than 4 years. I can only surmise that the person or persons to whom this release was made were the same individuals who paid for the political advertisement in which its first publication occurred.

Did those individuals disclose their identity when they arranged for the publication of this perjured and libelous testimony in a political advertisement? No, Mr. Speaker, they did not. On the contrary the only indication of the origin of this advertisement was a line in parentheses at the bottom of the ad, reading as follows:

The cost of this advertisement was paid for by a group of citizens who believe in good government and the American way of life.

God help good government and the American way of life if they must depend upon secret character assassination.

The witness Leech did not confine his smearing testimony to me, Mr. Speaker. Immediately after completing the perjured statement about me, which I just read to the House, he proceeded to swear that two of the most prominent men now holding elective offices in California were also members of the Communist Party. I doubt if either of those men knew, any more than I did, that they were being subjected to damaging testimony at the secret meeting down in Beaumont. They can speak for themselves, and undoubtedly will, if they are ever given an opportunity to do so. An interesting indication of the accuracy of Leech's testimony is that he assigned a wrong first name to one of these prominent California officials, although he swore that he knew him.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the members of the new standing Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives are

appointed, I intend to ask for the privilege of appearing before that committee to request that this witness Leech be subpoenaed for further questioning concerning his testimony about me.

I think nothing remains to be said, Mr. Speaker. This record speaks for itself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. At the time that this meeting was held in Beaumont, Tex., I was a member of the Dies committee and I want to say to the gentleman that I never heard about the holding of such a meeting or about any of this testimony with regard to him. The first time I knew anything about it was when the advertisement appeared in San Francisco.

On Friday last I addressed the House on the general subject of a proper investigation of un-American activities, what I believe it could accomplish if properly conducted and what I thought the dangers were if improperly conducted. I cited as one of my greatest fears that on the basis of unsupported, uncorroborated evidence a single member might make possible accusations of an untrue sort against an American citizen, an accusation of a most serious nature, and, as I put it on that occasion, it will deal a body blow to the institution of basic American political institutions. May I say to the gentleman that I think this procedure is indefensible and I would like to point out one thing further, if I may, and I would like to ask the gentleman: He was in Congress, as I recall it, in the Seventy-fifth and Seventy-sixth Congresses. What position did he hold prior to that time?

Mr. HAVENNER. Prior to the Seventy-fifth Congress?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. HAVENNER. I was a member and at that time president of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. For how many years did the gentleman hold that position?

Mr. HAVENNER. I was a member of the board of supervisors for 11 years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. After the gentleman ceased to be a Member of the House, what position did he hold in the interim between his service in the Congress before and his service now?

Mr. HAVENNER. I was appointed a member of the State railroad commission.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And was its chairman?

Mr. HAVENNER. I served as chairman of that commission also.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I submit to the House it is a pretty serious matter when a man with a record of that sort has to get up and make the speech which he has been called upon to make. I merely point out further that in Mr. Leech's testimony he makes not one single definite statement upon which any positive investigation could possibly be made to determine whether or not he was accurate with regard to it.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. May I say that I was also a member of the Dies committee when this incident is supposed to have happened in Beaumont, Tex. Here in the House is the first time I had ever heard about it. I have never known anything about the testimony or about the meeting that was held and I do not think either the House or the gentlemen on the floor should blame the committee for any such performance as we have had described today. It is too bad when any subcommittee or any committee of this House will hold, as has been stated, star-chamber proceedings and then keep those proceedings from the public and from the other members of the committee and from the House and only reveal them at the time of a political campaign. I think the new committee should go into this matter and find out just exactly what did happen and how this testimony was kept from the public for 4 years and then brought up in a political campaign in the shape of an advertisement.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman. I tried to make it plain that I knew most of the Members had no knowledge of this proceeding.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to point out further that in my speech of the 4th of January I suggested certain basic rules of procedure that should be, in my judgment, followed by any committee of this House. The second of those proposed rules of procedure that I proposed was as follows:

No public statements, press releases, communications, or reports involving the work and responsibilities of the committee shall be issued or released by any member thereof excepting after such statements, releases, communications, or reports have been submitted to the entire committee and approved by a majority thereof—

And I should have added, "or by any employee of the committee." Had that rule been observed this situation never could have taken place.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. May I say that it has been my privilege and, in fact, an honor to have been personally acquainted with the gentleman from California since the day that he first became a Member of this House. On many, many occasions I have enjoyed his company.

May I ask the gentleman if the record of the Dies committee shows who were members of this subcommittee?

Mr. HAVENNER. It only shows those who were present.

Mr. COCHRAN. What members were present?

Mr. HAVENNER. The record shows as present the Hon. Martin Dies, chairman, Robert E. Stripling, secretary of the committee, and James H. Stedman, investigator.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that there was only one Member

of the Congress present at that hearing, Mr. Dies. I was criticized the other day when I said that this was a one-man committee. I recall the name of Stedman, who the gentleman mentioned, and if I am not in error, he was in charge of the committee's Los Angeles office; was he not?

Mr. HAVENNER. I do not know.

Mr. COCHRAN. I can find out for the gentleman, because the vouchers to pay salaries came through my committee every month. I heard the gentleman mention the name of Stedman as asking this witness questions, and that confirms my contention that this committee has been more or less a one-man committee in the last few years. But this goes all the way back to 1940.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman for his statement concerning me.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I wish to inform the gentleman from Missouri that Mr. Stedman was the investigator in charge of the Los Angeles office. He is correct. He was one of the best investigators the Dies committee ever had.

May I also say to the gentleman that this committee was a one-man committee, and it worked both ways. At one time I went out to California and I was the only member of the committee who went out there. You could call me a one-man committee, then. Another time we sent a subcommittee out to California. Mr. Dies was not on that committee; neither was I. You might call that a three- or one-man committee. But all the way through this investigation, for 6½ years while we were investigating the Bund, while we were investigating the Communists, while we were investigating these Fascist crackpots—

Mr. IZAC. And Members of the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Certain Members have repeatedly opposed the committee and others opposed the committee only at certain times, but there were certain Members of the Congress, and I would include the gentleman from Missouri as having fought our committee at all times.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In further evidence, in view of what the gentleman from New Jersey has said, I want to show just exactly what a one-man committee this was. It so happened we had no business over the week end here several years ago. We adjourned on Thursday until Monday, so I just thought I would spend the week end in New York. I left here on the 1 o'clock train on Thursday. I had a seat in the parlor car. The gentleman from New Jersey came in that car and sat across from me. He had a large envelope. I said to him, "What are you going to do, work over the week end?" He said, "No; that is the white paper that Dies is releasing Sunday."

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. May I correct the gentleman?

Mr. COCHRAN. Just a moment now.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I said the Dies committee was releasing it; not Dies; the Dies committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I said to the gentleman, "Let me read it. I will not say anything about it until it is released." The gentleman said to me that he had never read it himself. I said, "Do you mean to say that you are letting a document of this size be released without even reading it?" He started to read then. As he read page after page of that proof he handed it to me, and it took 3 hours and 15 minutes to read that critical document which went out under the name of the Dies committee, of which he was a member. He admitted he had never read it himself.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman is wrong as usual. I want to say that the document was not released until the members of the committee had read the document. I was at that time starting to read the proof of the document, and the gentleman was so insistent that he also be given the same privilege to read the document that I turned it over to the gentleman from Missouri.

I want to tell you how the gentleman from Missouri can also be wrong in connection with his own committee. Just the other day I received a letter from the gentleman from Missouri bawling me out for having sent a telegram at Government expense. So I wrote the gentleman from Missouri and I enclosed the telegram, and I told him in my letter that it was clearly marked up on top that the telegram should be charged to me. So the gentleman very kindly, I will say, sent me a letter of apology, and I now accept that apology.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I only rise to say a few words. I think the action in this case speaks louder than any words of any members of the Dies committee or myself.

We of California know the gentleman from San Francisco and have great confidence not only in his ability but in his integrity. We have known him for over 20 years. He has served the people of California well, as well as the people of all the United States. I think it is a most dastardly thing to have such a thing as this done by one Member of Congress against another Member of Congress.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like to propound two questions to the gentleman from California, for whom I have great respect and for whom the people of California have great respect, as shown by their repeated election of him to public office. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the laws regarding perjury in Texas are outlawed at the end of 3 years, and that this testimony was released subsequent to the outlawing of the laws regarding perjury?

Mr. HAVENNER. I was not aware of that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That happens to be the case.

May I propound this question through the gentleman from California to the gentleman from New Jersey, who is always so anxious to defend all of the actions of this committee. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey condones the action of this committee or a subcommittee thereof in investigating the gentleman from California and releasing such executive action to the public press.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I will answer that. Of course not. In fact, I was not here when the gentleman from California started his speech, and I really do not know what he started to talk about, but if it is in line with what the gentleman says, of course not. Our committee would not condone it and I would not condone it. The gentleman from California enjoys a very high reputation, and so does the Dies committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. May I say to the gentleman from California that I have known him all during his tenures of office in this House, and I can testify to his earnest patriotism and his willingness to serve this country with all that is in him. I heard the gentleman from California the other day outline certain rules of procedure that should be followed by the new committee. For the new Members, may I state that the Dies committee and its chairman, Mr. Dies himself, had the temerity to pay out of the expenses appropriated for the Dies committee the settlement of a private lawsuit. The chairman had been sued for libel, and he had the temerity to come into this House and say that that case was settled, this private lawsuit was settled by the use of funds appropriated by this Congress for expenses of the Dies committee. I hope the gentleman from California will revise his suggested rules so as to prohibit any such outlandish practices.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I also know the gentleman and have served with him in the House. I know something about the Dies committee and what they have been doing. The gentleman from California is not the only victim in this mess. When the truth is known, it will be found that there are hundreds of Americans who have been labeled as un-American based upon testimony that was not fit to believe. If the proper thing were done, if that committee is going to function, we ought to go back and restore respect for Americans who have been charged without proof with being Communists or believers in other "isms," when there was not a scintilla of evidence to prove it.

On this floor at least for the last 2 or 3 years I have stated that this was a one-man committee of Dies, Dies, and Dies, and that the rest of the committee, who are now defending it, had not even

taken the trouble to find out what was going on in the "White House" of Texas.

I have been attacked by certain Members of this House who criticized me by saying I was envious because I was not on that committee. The truth is that I was the originator of the original committee in 1934. My purpose and the policy of the McCormack-Dickstein committee was to give every American an opportunity at least to defend himself before we passed judgment. All the rules that were laid down by my friend from California [Mr. VOORHIS] are not going to do a blessed thing. We have to watch our step and be careful where we are going with this committee and the way we are going, because we are destroying democracy.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to add my testimony of absolute faith in the full Americanism of the gentleman, having served with him and being associated with him for a number of years. May I add, also, that this same Dies committee attacked the name of an outstanding citizen of Alabama, for which they were condemned by both the Senators from our State. I think the gentleman from New Jersey signed the document. I am pretty sure he did. If he did not, he has plenty of time, a whole year, to straighten it out.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I suggest that the gentleman from Alabama should look it up to find out if I did sign it before making any kind of statement. I note that the gentleman from New York has changed the name of the McCormack committee to the McCormack-Dickstein committee.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has yielded to me and I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has the floor and he yields to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. And they took Mr. William Mitch, who was a steward in the Methodist Church, an active churchman and Shriner, and a well-known Mason and outstanding citizen, and placarded him before the country as a Communist. So the gentleman has company. The gentleman has good company. Of course, it may not be true with the Members of this body, but I think the people of America have been in accord there, especially in the Democratic ranks, in the expression of their condemnation of the unfair methods practiced.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in order for me to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] a question on his time?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield if I have further time.

Mr. FOLGER. I believe that the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is gone. But I believe the gentleman did state, however, that he had never himself, although he was a member of this committee until he got disgusted and resigned, that he had never heard of this

thing until it was published for political purposes a few months ago.

Mr. HAVENNER. I think that is correct; yes.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman give the names of those who questioned this witness? Was it Mr. Dies himself, or was it this man Stripling or Matthews?

Mr. HAVENNER. I think most of the questions were asked by Mr. Stedman.

Mr. SABATH. Is he still with the committee? Does the gentleman know, and this man Stripling?

Mr. HAVENNER. I do not know.

Mr. SABATH. Do you think he should remain with the committee in view of that performance and his activity in view of the fact that he should have the knowledge that the evidence that he secured was purely a lie and perjury and an untruth about you?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there are not any members of the Dies committee present because there is not any such committee as yet pending the appointment of members to the committee.

The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended at least 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be an opportunity after the expiration of the 10 minutes for others to call attention to some more of this smearing campaign that went on and the sources which it came from and of things they said?

The SPEAKER. There is no legislative program before the House today and all Members who desire to address the House will be recognized to do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would it be in order then, Mr. Speaker, to ask now for extension of the time that I have?

Mr. RANKIN. Do not interfere with his time; you can have time later.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was not worrying about his time. I am just worrying about you taking the time.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be recognized and the Chair will certainly entertain a unanimous-consent request to extend his time for a longer period.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] and having served with him more intimately than any of these men who have testified up to now, during the time that he was in Congress and joined with me in the power fight, I want to say to him that, in my humble opinion, Mr.

Dies did not attach any importance to this testimony. We all know the gentleman from California, and the criticism I would have to offer is that his attention was not called to it.

The very statement of the gentleman from California is one of the greatest arguments I have heard in favor of making this a permanent committee or a standing committee of the House in order that it may be governed by the regular rules of the House.

I have great respect for him, and I regret that this testimony was ever given out. It should have been submitted to him, and he should have been given an opportunity to answer it.

But the mere fact that somebody got hold of the files of this committee and published something that some alleged Communist had said about a Member of Congress is no argument at all in favor of condemning the great work of the Dies committee and condemning Congress for continuing it as a permanent committee of the House. I have heard from every State, and I would say from almost every congressional district, in the United States praising us for perpetuating this committee as a standing committee of the House, not as a witch-hunting committee, as some of its enemies have alleged, not to go out and smear somebody, but to help protect American institutions from those influences that are threatening them from within as well as from without.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TOLAN. I wish to ask the gentleman from California if he had any conversation with Chairman Dies prior or subsequent to this testimony which was given at Beaumont, Tex.

Mr. HAVENNER. I may say to the gentleman from California that during the Congressional campaign of 1940 I was informed by a friend in San Francisco that he had information on what he considered good authority that an attempt might be made to smear my reputation before the Dies committee. I went to see Mr. Dies and told him that I had heard this report on what seemed to be good authority and asked that if any such attempt should be made I be given an opportunity to appear before the committee. Mr. Dies replied that nothing of the sort had been attempted and that if it was he would notify me and give me an opportunity to appear.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Did he give you such an opportunity?

Mr. HAVENNER. I never received it.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Mississippi claims, and I presume he is right, that a great many American people have the utmost confidence in the Dies committee. I may say to him they do because they have heard only from Dies and sometimes from his two managers and investigators whose names have been mentioned. In that way they have obtained a great deal of information favorable to the committee. But the fact was not given to the American

people that the gentleman from California was smeared. There are hundreds of other people of standing who have been assailed and attacked and charged with being Communists when they were no more Communists than Mr. Dies or any member of the committee, or the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]; but they too did not have a chance to defend themselves and the people of America did not know how unfair the activities of Mr. Dies were.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I asked the gentleman to yield because I understood the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] asked a question a while ago when I was temporarily off the floor. I will be glad to answer it if he wants me to. Does the gentleman remember what the question was?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for the purpose of repeating the question.

Mr. FOLGER. The question was whether the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] did not say that he never knew a thing in the world about this until it was published last fall.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true; that is what I did say and that is the fact.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I am sorry I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's statement. We have no way, of course, of telling who the members of the new committee will be, but I should like to make this suggestion to the new committee: That they call in this witness and allow the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] to be there at the same time and give the gentleman from California every consideration it possibly can. I do not like that kind of article any more than the gentleman does and I feel that the gentleman from California should be given every consideration and the opportunity of questioning the witness.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman. I stated that it was my intention to appear before the committee and ask for that opportunity.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to what the gentleman from New Jersey said, if anything like that is done there should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

Without entering into a discussion of the investigation but confining it to the gentleman's case and without in any way saying anything that might be construed as critical of the hearing, the gentleman has said that the testimony was false. The gentleman from California

is a Member of the House. It might happen to any one of us. If that testimony was false it means that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear the gentleman for no particular purpose. It seems to me to be a matter of interest to each and every Member of the House and I think, speaking as an individual, if anything is done that the committee should go further and if they do find falsehoods look into them. They will find falsehoods, for the gentleman has denied that the statements were true. They should investigate the conspiracy because it concerns every Member of this body.

As far as the gentleman himself is concerned, I have served with him, and I believe I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body. The gentleman may differ with me on this or that question, or differ with some of us who serve with him, but because we differ on public questions does not mean that we are not good Americans; it means simply a difference in our individual conscience and our individual judgment as to the best interests of the country. We may disagree as to judgment, but every man here has a love of America and is actuated by the same high patriotic motives as the gentleman from California who enjoys the confidence of every Member on each side of the aisle, as far as I know, who serves with him. I rise particularly to make this contribution because the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] enjoys our respect and confidence and because we recognize that he is both honorable and trustworthy.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It is my feeling that the entire membership of the House accepts as their view the utterances made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I do not believe there is a Member of the House who questions the accuracy of the gentleman's statement and certainly no Member questions his patriotism.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Without in any way attempting to excuse that most reprehensible attack made on the gentleman, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, in view of what he said, if he will either reintroduce or join me in attempting to put through the Rules Committee the resolution offered more than 2½ years ago which was designed to accomplish just what he is advocating, an investigation of the conspiracies which have been formed, not only in this particular case but in dozens of other cases throughout the country, to destroy the confidence of the people in their Representatives?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California desire to proceed further?

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I may say to the gentleman that I have listened very attentively to his speech and to the remarks made here today, and I may say that is the very reason I offered a resolution, which is Resolution No. 58, to repeal the amendment to the rules creating a certain standing committee. I do not believe that the House of Representatives should be made a continuing investigating body investigating individuals or people who may not have the same views as other people. I believe that in a democratic government people should have the right of free speech, free press, and free religion without regard to race, creed, color, or ancestry. For that reason I would like to urge the Members of the House and the Rules Committee to give consideration to that resolution and at least have hearings to determine whether or not we acted deliberately at the time we agreed to that rule.

May I say further in closing that it is my understanding, at one time during the existence of the previous committee, there were 300, possibly more, names submitted to the F. B. I., and out of those names it is my understanding there were only 2 at which any criticism could be leveled. The rest of them were smeared. It is about time we stopped smearing people for their political beliefs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Did not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] insert some letters in the Record here that were found to be forged?

Mr. HOOK. You are talking about a conspiracy that was a real conspiracy. Does the gentleman know that David D. Mann, who was on the pay roll of the Dies committee at that time, was convicted and sentenced to prison for from 2 to 6 years for that? You talk about a conspiracy.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. David Mann was never on the pay roll of the Dies committee.

Mr. HOOK. David Mann received pay from the Dies committee.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman did not let me finish my question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Mississippi—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will suspend also. The gentleman from California has the floor and unless he yields to a Member and a Member interrupts, that Member is out of order in trying to stop him. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I addressed the House in this manner today because I understood that under the rules of the House I could not rise to a question of personal privilege on this matter. I would have made a similar statement if this report had emanated from any committee other than the Dies committee. I rose really on a question of personal privilege, although that was not in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate that fact, and I may say to the gentleman from California that from my viewpoint he was entitled to rise under a question of personal privilege if this material had been published while he was a Member.

As I said to the gentleman a moment ago, we all deplore this incident so far as he is concerned. But that is no reason for the enemies of the Dies committee destroying it. They do not stand a chance to destroy it. It reminds me of a man who had his wife and children in a boat crossing the lake, when a little snake dropped into the boat; instead of taking his paddle and killing it or throwing it out, he excitedly took up his gun and shot the bottom out of the boat.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] does not stand any more chance of repealing the rule setting up this committee than Gov. Bob Taylor's proverbial gutta-percha dog did to catch the asbestos cat in hades.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter received from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial published in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin on Future Defense Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record in two instances; in one to include a newspaper article, and in the other to include a statement I made in regard to a bill that I introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ARE WE SCRAPPING THE TYDINGS AMENDMENT?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has directed a letter to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, asking that he re-examine all deferred farm workers.

It is my pleasure to represent in this House, one of the most purely farm States of this Union—North Dakota. As a Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I had occasion to request General Hershey on numerous occasions to analyze the effectiveness of the selective-service law upon the food-producing sections of the Nation. At that time, tremendous inroads were being made upon the farm population. You will remember that farmers and their sons were not then regarded as essential to the war effort. In my visits to North Dakota during that period, I discovered alarming situations. The selective service had taken the boys from the farms, leaving the fathers, who were 65 years of age or older, in charge of these extensive farming operations and large dairy herds. Everywhere I went I was faced with sale bills where important dairy herds were being thrown on the market and where farmers were liquidating their farming operations, unable to carry on without their boys.

I appealed to General Hershey to review this situation. I was not alone in this effort, of course. The records show that in due time food came to be regarded as a very essential thing, and accordingly farmers were placed in the category of essential industries. This occurred through the Tydings amendment.

And now, at this time, I feel it my duty to present the case of my State of North Dakota in regard to the drafting of boys from our farms. In doing so, I present, I believe the case of the farm situation of the whole country. It is true, that favor in deferment has been granted to farm boys, just as favor has been granted to scientific minds in industry and the many phases of labor in industry. And I can readily understand that when our Nation stands on the brink of danger, those who have to do with the conduct of war see only war itself. That is humanly natural. I can readily see that in their search for more men, when they refer to their records and see the deferment of farm boys to the amount of 364,000 between the ages of 18 and 25, trained as they are to hard work, it offers a field for them. They would make an excellent source of supply for the armed forces.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that the growing of food is just as essential as any part of our war effort. In most cases, these boys deferred for farm labor cannot be replaced on these farms. Older men, reared in urban life, do not seek farm work, however patriotic they may be. Huge farms, stretching across the prairies, endless in appearance, seem to reach the horizon. These farms can be cared for only by mechanized methods. True, fewer men are required on these mechanized farms, but we have already reached that minimum of men. Machinery on these

farms requires trained minds. Costly machinery used in farming as an industry cannot be run by rail splitters.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman is discussing a timely subject. Recently when I was home I called on a farmer who owns and operates a 400-acre farm. He is a big cattle grower. He is now 75 years of age. He is unable to work. His wife showed me on the wall of his living room photographs of three 200-pound east Tennesseans, every one of whom is in the armed services and everyone of whom has been in combat.

That man told me it would be impossible this year for him to operate his farm and produce food to carry on his cattle operations. I know it to be a fact that all over east Tennessee and all over the State, for that matter, farms have been stripped of their manpower through the operation of the selective-service law and through the fact that there are war industries there that are paying labor all the way from \$8 to \$15 per day. The people are faced with a fact. The men who are stripping the farms of manpower do not know what they are doing. They are never consistent. They start out to do a thing one day and get everybody all excited, and then the next day they reverse themselves and head in the other direction. It is time for some sanity and common sense to be used in the administration of that law. We cannot fight unless we eat. Any army travels on its belly, and the people in industry and other lines of endeavor in this country must have something to eat.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution.

All phases of farm life in this Nation have made great forward steps in the dairy industry. My State is no exception to the rule. This also requires trained minds and experienced hands. We cannot reduce further these trained men on the farms of our country.

Quoting Mr. John Brandt, president of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, he speaks as follows:

A full scale drafting of workers in the 18 to 25 age class from dairy farms would cut 1945 milk production by as much as 5,000,000,000 pounds.

Mr. Speaker, I have scarcely met a boy who has been deferred for farm work who does not in some degree resent it. He feels he, too, should be shouldering a gun, flying a plane, or taking some place in the armed service of his country. There is less glamor in running a tractor, or a milking machine, or doing many other things necessary in the production of foodstuffs than in flying a bomber or parachuting over enemy terrain. He feels that in his part of the fight here he will be deprived of the honor and glory that will be awarded to his city friends, and yet he is engaged in a very noble part of the war effort.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, our Nation's part as one of the great Allies of this World War. Let us not forget that food is a very vital weapon in the

hands of this administration in its policies and dealings with the liberated countries. As each country is liberated by the Allied forces, it becomes the problem of the United States to feed those people, and great as has been our part and great as our part is today in the actual fighting on the five fronts of this war, of no less importance is our contribution of food to those people whom we liberate. And not to them alone, but also to Russia, to England, and now to Italy and France. Regardless of the marvelous contributions to the war which this country has made, I say that without our part in the production of food alone, this war would already have been lost. Handicapped enormously by lack of men and of machinery, our farmers have made heroic effort and amazing contributions to this phase of the war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my understanding that the gentleman from North Dakota is making his appeal not as a matter of trying to get the farm boys deferred for themselves, which is something that the farm boys do not want, but because of the lack of the production of food and the lack of food which will undoubtedly stare us in the face very shortly and become acute if the present policies are adhered to.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct. I think in the concluding part of my remarks I cover that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I compliment the gentleman from North Dakota for basing his argument entirely upon the production of food without any regard whatsoever to the matter of trying to get the farm boys out of the draft, which none of us want to do.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I recognize how difficult is the task of those men concerned with the organization of humanity in this great war effort, and I have no disposition to raise my voice against them as they go forth to do their work. But I do feel it my serious duty to present to the Congress this side of the picture, with which I am particularly familiar. We must not, in our effort to bring about an early peace, lose sight of this very vital phase of war work. With few exceptions, these 364,000 farm boys want to go into the armed forces, but it just cannot be done. We in the United States are beginning to feel the pinch for the first time in the life of this generation on the question of food within our own country, and yet not one of us would hesitate to make every sacrifice necessary; but sacrifice is not the problem, production is the problem.

The President told us in his speech on the state of the Nation that the problem of the liberated countries would be great. No problem there will be greater than the one of supplying food. Now, as we wage war on five different fronts, more and more of everything is required, particularly of food products. Shortages begin to appear because all commodities, whether it be food, cigarettes, tanks, or any other phase of war material, are pouring out through five different pipe lines—pipe lines thousands of miles in length that must be kept crammed full from one end to the other, from the place where they start until they discharge their cargo.

As a representative from the great farm State of North Dakota, I have this to say to this Congress, and I say it with deep conviction and an intimate knowledge of the facts: There may be some sections of this country where a surplus of farm labor exists, but in our country—a land of great, limitless prairies—we have long ago scraped the bottom of our manpower barrel. I say we have reached the point of diminishing returns. I am not here addressing the Congress for the purpose of holding in my State these young men to shield them from danger or sacrifice. Doing so would be an insult to them. I have but one ambition, and that is to present to our leaders in my feeble manner the important side of this question, particularly as they look to my State for help. There is every reason there will be a continuation of the war for some time to come. Should this be true, even the drafting of 364,000 farm youth would not be sufficient to end the war. Remember, the longer the war goes on the greater will become the demand for farm products, because it is the policy of this administration primarily so, perhaps, to use money and food in our diplomatic relations with our allies and with the other countries of the globe.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. In that connection this is total war, and the man between the plow handles, the man producing foodstuffs, is just as much a member of our armed forces as if he had a uniform on and a gun in his hand. The man at the lathe, the man in the shop, the man in the mines, and the man in the factory building the implements of war is projecting himself and his muscle and skill to the battle front. What we mean, I think, and what I believe you have in mind and we all have in mind, is to so coordinate all the efforts of our people so that there will not be a lag in any particular. We must have food. We must keep the Army going. I know of another incident in my district. I had a letter the other day from a father and mother who have four boys in the armed services and a fifth boy about to go in. They own a 200-acre farm. Two of their boys have been killed in action, one in July and one in August. They made the appeal that one of the boys in the armed services be permitted to come back home. Well, the exigencies are such that the request was turned down. Those things

not only have a heart appeal but they adjust themselves and should adjust themselves to the sound judgment and discretion of the men in authority so that a case like that might not become a tragedy, not only because of the extreme hardship but because of the tragedy of these two old people who are physically unable to operate their farm, who must sit there in the shadows in their great grief, having lost two boys and having two others in the service and with the fifth boy about to go. It does look as if something might be done not only to enable them to operate their farm which is the source of their livelihood, but something might be done which would in some measure assuage their great grief and atone in some way for the great sacrifices they have made on behalf of their country.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman again for the fine contribution, Mr. Speaker.

Since this is our policy, may I suggest that we most carefully review every phase of the situation before, in fever heat, we move out and draft from the farms these essential young men who are today engaged in a life of hard work and drudgery, with no pay for overtime, no 40-hour week, no further reward—nothing but hard work from sunrise to sunset, doing their part nobly and patriotically in every sense of the word. Can we afford to destroy this all-important productive capacity of one of the most essential elements in all warfare?

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ABSURDITIES IN PROPOSALS TO DRAFT LABOR AND NURSES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, every patriotic citizen familiar with the facts concedes the necessity for increased production for war, for more and better care for war's casualties, but thinking citizens, desirous of reestablishing and maintaining the "four freedoms," constitutional government here at home, see no necessity—on the contrary, great danger if we follow blindly the administration's proposal—to draft the IV-F's, nurses, and farm workers.

If we accept, as we do, Churchill's statement that, from a military and economic standpoint, we are the most powerful Nation in the world, and at the same time remember that we attained and now hold that position under and because of our constitutional form of government, even the least unobserving and thoughtful should see the folly of exchanging the best for something less efficient, more restrictive of the opportunity for freedom and prosperity.

The administration's policy of forcing everyone under Federal control, making everyone and everything subject to ad-

ministrative orders and directives, leads to but one end—a dictatorship.

Nor can it be said that the United States is not doing its part; bearing its share of the burden of this war. It is matter of common knowledge that once again we came to the aid of the British Empire when it was in dire straits; that the materials of war furnished Russia enabled her to make her drive against Germany; saved her from the German invasion.

The food, the clothing, the merchandise furnished by us have gone a long, long way toward preventing civil war in Italy and Greece.

We now have 12,000,000 young Americans in the service; the battle lines in Belgium, France, and Italy are held largely by American troops; the estimate being that from 60 to 80 percent of the men on the fighting front are Americans.

It is time, yes, long past time, that there should be some definite guaranteed agreement as to the objectives of our allies, as to the part which America is expected to take, not only in the war but after the war is over.

If, as was stated in the Senate yesterday by Republican Members of that body, American youth is to be drafted to police Europe and that without the consent or action of Congress, but at the will of the President, in all fairness the American people should know the form of government which is to be imposed upon the conquered countries, or whether the people of those countries are to be permitted to choose their own form of government.

Without in any way criticizing our allies, it may be said it apparently is now true that in certain sections of Europe we must, to use a common expression, clear through Stalin; in other sections clear through Churchill.

There is no reason why here at home we should forsake our constitutional methods and procedure, clear through Sidney Hillman. It is long past time when someone should arise in this country, speak for America, act in the interest of America.

The American people went into this war reluctantly. Some thought that it was necessary for the preservation of our own national existence; the overwhelming majority did not believe that but have supported the war because they thought we were to carry the "four freedoms" to downtrodden people throughout the world.

Those whose sons, brothers, and husbands are dying because of this war have the right to know whether we are fighting to preserve and extend the British Empire; whether we are fighting to make Russia's claims good; whether we are fighting to aid the submerged millions of the world. They have the right to know whether in another generation or two we are to be called to again fight, not Germany, if the plan to hold her people in subjugation succeeds, but whether in Europe another nation will threaten the British Empire, civilization, or democracy, and if it does, whether we will be called to carry the burden of that war. Whether that menace will be met on the centuries-old battlefields of Europe or

whether we will stay out; make ourselves so strong here at home from an economic and military standpoint that any nation will hesitate to attack us; that if it does it will meet defeat before it invades our shores.

The above information should be given us before we accept the administration's plan to draft men and women for civilian service; for industrial work; before we adopt universal conscription.

If the war lords of Europe are fighting to but extend and make secure their national interest, there is every reason why America should not exhaust herself in efforts to aid them. We should conserve and increase our strength, provide for our own impregnable defense.

Experience has now demonstrated that neither Hitler's, Stalin's, nor Churchill's form of government, to say nothing of Italy and France, can lead us further nor for that matter as far, along the road to happiness, prosperity, and security, as have our own methods.

When New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and Canada, all integral parts of the British Empire, which exists today only because we came to its rescue, refused to conscript their men to serve the Empire and her needs beyond the confines of their home lands, there would seem little reason why America should conscript her men, her women, and then put them, while engaged in civilian activities, under the control of the Federal Government—of a dictator.

This war has demonstrated the patriotism of our people, their willingness to fight—to fight not only for their own country, their own institutions, but to sacrifice their lives for others, for other nations—nations which are interested not in establishing the Four Freedoms throughout the world, but in extending their spheres of influence, their own material well-being.

That being true, let this Congress insist that this administration, which demands so much power, which has to this date exercised powers never granted it in favor of special groups in return for political support, from this time on put into effect that principal expressed in the legend carried over the entrance of the Supreme Court here in Washington, "Equal justice under law."

Only last Monday, 4 days ago, one of the Justices of the United States Supreme Court, who concurred in overruling an opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, which upheld an act requiring those soliciting membership in unions to register with the State, frankly stated, in substance, that the United States Supreme Court was extending to the representatives of labor unions the exercise of a right denied to employers. That decision went a long way on the road to establish a double standard in the administration of the law. That decision denied to employers "Equal justice under law."

The administration's proposal to draft the IV-F's into military service, put them into work battalions, or force them to work in industry, without at the same time freeing them from the administration's policy and orders which would compel them to join a union, be and remain a member of a union, pay an initia-

tion fee and such monthly dues and special assessments as the politically-minded bosses of some of the unions might impose, analyzed and plainly stated, partakes of the nature of a conspiracy to compel American citizens to contribute to a campaign fund, become members of an organization which is under political allegiance to the administration.

PRESIDENT DOES NOT KEEP HIS PROMISE

As has all too often happened, the President has not kept faith with the workers or the employers. It was on the 13th of November 1941, that Franklin D. Roosevelt told the American people that:

The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

At that time there was a strike on, and talking face to face with John L. Lewis, who was speaking for the United Mine Workers, Mr. Roosevelt said:

The Government will never compel this (remaining) 5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor.

Nevertheless, in recent months and since Pearl Harbor, the President, through his executive agencies, has time and time again compelled nonunion men to join a union, a procedure which he himself said "would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor."

When the President learns that honesty is the best policy, when he considers his words before making a promise, then keeps that promise, or, if that be impossible, frankly admits the necessity for a change, the American people will have more faith in him, in his administration. They will be more united in their efforts.

This administration, through executive agencies, in peacetime and now in wartime, has acted as an organizing agent, as a recruiting agency for the organizations of would-be political bosses.

The National Labor Relations Board earlier in its existence and the present War Labor Board now deliberately has followed a course and issued orders, the logical result of which has been to enable unions, without legal authority, to levy and collect taxes from workers who desired to do their utmost in aid of an increased war production.

At the moment, when the President is telling the people that hundreds of thousands of additional young men must be sent to the battle front, that there is need for billions of dollars of tax money, to be spent to carry on the Government and the war effort—some eighty-three billion—he is employing the Army to seize, take over, and operate the retail stores of Montgomery Ward & Co.

Instead of devoting undivided effort to the war, where on the western German front our men are suffering, fighting, and dying in snow, in freezing mud, he is keeping one eye on the political front here at home and following a course which will increase the political power and prestige of those who claim that to their efforts he owes his reelection.

The administration's excuse—it is no reason—for the seizure of Ward's retail stores was that certain Ward employees who were members of the C. I. O. were on

strike and that unless their demands were granted by Ward the strike would continue and sympathetic strikes would be called by other C. I. O. unions in Detroit and elsewhere, which would adversely affect war production.

It was therefore necessary, said the administration, in order to prevent strikes in war industries, which would slow up production, to seize Ward's retail stores and grant the demands of the C. I. O. union which had members in those stores.

Just read that again.

The same reasoning would require the policeman who came upon a hold-up man and his victim to force the victim to submit because the robber had pals throughout the city and unless the victim did submit the pals would start holding up other good citizens.

Even though other C. I. O. unions in Ford's, in General Motors, in industrial plants throughout the Detroit area had no grievances, if the demands of their affiliate in Ward's were not granted, a hundred or more C. I. O. unions, with hundreds of thousands of employees engaged in essential war work, would go out on strike—take part in picketing Ward's retail stores—so it was threatened.

The proposition needs but to be stated to show its absurdity. The administration's course does establish one thing, and that is its complete domination, in this instance, by the C. I. O. political leadership.

WHY DRAFT MEN TO COLLECT UNION DUES?

Perhaps you remember that one of the first demands made by the union labor leaders when the Army seized and began to operate Ward's retail stores was that the Army compel Ward's employees to pay the dues which for 13 successive months employees of Ward's, exercising their rights under the Constitution, refused to pay into the union treasury.

The President is using the Army as a collecting agency for his political ally, the C. I. O. That is a fact, and no volume of abuse, no multitude of words used in name calling, no lying charges that criticism indicates a lack of patriotism will change the fact.

While men are needed in Europe and in the Pacific, while men are needed in factories, mines, and mills to send an ever-increasing volume of supplies to the armed forces, the President, to aid the C. I. O. in obtaining dominion over employees of Ward's, in a civil retail business, ordered the Army to take possession, follow a course which will ultimately compel them to join a union, pay tribute to that union.

Unions have no legal right to levy and collect taxes, but the policy followed by the administration has given them that power.

FARM LABOR

The administration has determined that it is our policy not only to feed, clothe, furnish fuel and shelter, for the people of the liberated countries, but that we are to supply the needy in other lands with much of their food and clothing, and that we are to rebuild—rehabilitate it is termed—the towns, cities, and countries, which have suffered from

Germany's power and cruelty. That being true, and the administration having also adopted the policy of sending abroad quantities of farm machinery, a policy of drafting farm boys for work in industrial plants just does not make sense.

The administration has also adopted a policy of paying high wages to industrial workers, furnishing many of them housing, granting them special privileges. That policy has brought the farmer into competition with a Government-subsidized industry, which pays a wage from two to eight times as great as that which it is possible for the farmer to pay and make both ends meet.

Not only do we ship abroad farm machinery badly needed here at home, but the farmer is put in direct competition with the high-paid factory workers, a portion of whose wage is met by payments on Government contracts.

If the farm boys are to be drafted and be sent abroad, will farm production meet our needs? Will the clerks who are drafted from the stores, those who are taken from factories because they will not work, be sent to the farms?

Will those drafted and put upon farms have the knowledge requisite to perform the task assigned them? Will they work more than the 35 or the 40 hours a week which has been their practice, without being paid for overtime? What of the union man sent to a farm and who finds that cows must be milked two or three times a day; that they must be milked on Saturday and Sunday, as well as on Friday and Monday? Or does the administration contemplate for farm work a swing shift?

If the individual or the co-op which operates a dairy, a cheese factory, a creamery, any sort of an industry processing farm products, refuses to sign a union contract with a security-of-membership clause, or to pay the wage demanded by the union which happens to be the collective-bargaining agent, will the Government send in an Army officer to operate the dairy, or the cheese factory, as it did to operate the retail business at Ward's? And, if the business did not make enough money to pay the wage fixed by the Government, will they make an appropriation from the Treasury to meet the deficiency?

We should take a look at the possibilities, the probabilities, which may flow out of the rules, regulations, interpretations, which will be put out by an executive agency attempting to produce food by farming. Fair and equal consideration of every citizen will get the Government more and quicker production than any granting of special favors to pressure groups.

**TWENTY-FOUR HOURS FOR THE SOLDIERS—PART
TIME FOR US**

To me, in wartime, limited hours of work, or paying additional compensation for hours worked over a certain number does not make sense. I can see no reason for discrimination between the task imposed upon men drafted into the armed service and upon those who remain at home. It is the young men, many of whom have not yet reached the voting age, many of whom have never had an opportunity to enjoy the good

things of this life, who are conscripted and sent to the battle front. They give all of their time, perhaps their lives, to the service of their country, while here at home we bicker, we quarrel, and we fight over how many hours we are to work, over what we are to be paid. Many of us shirk, spend more for luxuries, as well as for necessities, and still we complain and gripe.

From more than one industry we receive information that production has not reached the limit. To me, as to others, have come specific instances of the slow-down, sometimes because of union demands, sometimes because the industrialists for one reason or another held down production.

Recently there came to my office a manufacturer, the owner of a comparatively small plant who had taken subcontracts for the manufacture of a small casting. He had estimated the cost of production, calculated the number of units which could be made per day. He discovered after the contract was taken that a large plant had been and was making but half the number per day which he figured he could produce. He and his production men were frightened but they had the contract so they went ahead, and they learned that they could manufacture not twice but more than three times the number of units per day produced by the larger plant. The difference in production, according to his statement, did not grow out of greater skill, better machinery, but was the result of the efforts of the workers in his plant, most of whom came from farms or small towns and had no union boss.

In the larger plant it was not the fault of the men on the job that production was at a minimum, it was the fault of certain union politicians who believed in the doctrine of scarcity.

Before men who are needed at home, who have been rejected by the armed forces, are drafted, we should make certain that neither Sidney Hillman, nor any of those who think as he does, or have in mind the same purpose, should have any control over, should in any way determine the policy under which they are to serve or work.

If IV-F's are put into factories, work beside union men, discrimination in wages or hours will never be acceptable to them, and it is more than probable that they will no more than reach their jobs than Sidney will make his demand that they come under union jurisdiction.

If you think that idea is absurd, just remember that when the Navy was manufacturing planes at Brewster a union under Tom De Lorenzo gave orders to men who had taken an oath of allegiance to our country.

When the administration adopts a policy of "Equal justice under law"; when it ceases its drive to make citizens subject to the orders of its political allies; to come under the control in their daily lives of administrative agencies; then it will be on the road toward national unity and an all-out effort.

The orders of the O. P. A. have, time and again, in the midst of an abundance, established a scarcity. Because of O. P. A. defiance of nature's laws, of the law of supply and demand, of its assumption

that a small group of men are all-wise, we have had a shortage of butter; of meat; an overabundance of eggs; a shortage of poultry; first a shortage of potatoes and then potatoes rotting by the carload on city dumps; rationed cheese, cheese spoiling in warehouses; a shortage of gasoline; of tires; of farm implements—of this, that, and the other. In my judgment, all due to the fact that no group of men, however wise, however industrious, however efficient, can obliterate human greed and selfishness, the desire to profit; suspend the operations of nature's laws.

The O. P. A. has in common parlance bit off more than it can chew.

Now if the administration drafts nurses, drafts labor, it will find itself in a more serious and dangerous situation with more of waste, confusion, and inefficiency in production than has been created by the O. P. A.

I have not the slightest objection to compelling everyone to do his part, either by way of contributions of money, or labor to the war effort, but I do object to making nurses, farm workers, the IV-F's or anyone else subject, through administrative orders, to a policy or a program conceived by, put into effect by Sidney Hillman or any other left-winger or Communist.

When the President asserts his independence of the corrupt city machines; when he frees himself of the influences of those who do not believe in the American system of government, he will find the people more than willing to bring about some of his objectives.

As long ago as January of 1943 bills were introduced by me which would have put those who refused to work in support of the war effort, regardless of their physical condition, or their age, into the military service; to be assigned by that service to whatever position it might be determined they could best perform. But with that bill there was another bill which, if adopted, would have made it impossible for any official of the Government, any union, or member of a union, to demand as a condition precedent, to the exercising of the right to work in industry, the payment of tribute.

What this Government needs at the moment is a return to the principle of equality—of equal justice—an end to special favors; and to the attempt to overturn our system of government and establish some form of communism, socialism, fascism, or dictatorship.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CANCELANON OF FOOD RATION POINTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I am about to make and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SERIOUS CHARGE AGAINST O. P. A. ANSWERED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a statement was made to the press by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I expect to comment on that statement today. I called the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] over the telephone and told him that I did expect to comment on it and hoped he would be here. His statement of course outlines a state of facts which we regret very much were necessary. The gentleman from Minnesota in his statement says:

O. P. A. SWINDLES AMERICAN CONSUMERS
(By Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota)

Millions of thrifty American housewives have been swindled out of rationed food supplies when Economic Stabilizer Vinson and O. P. A. Director Bowles conspired to issue the new ration order which canceled unused red and blue stamps.

I am satisfied that the War Food Administration, which is in charge of food supplies, was bypassed and not consulted, when the O. P. A. fixed up this Christmas present for the American people, especially when we consider the latest report from the Department of Agriculture which states: "This year (1944) total production of food was the highest in history." We now have the largest cattle, poultry, and grain supplies in our history, and if the Administration will let nature take its course, we will have an abundance of hogs and other food commodities in 1945.

I want the men and women in the armed forces to have an abundance of the best American food. But I hate to see my Government deliberately cheat patriotic Americans who are doing everything possible to help win the war and back their boys on the fighting fronts. We need more honesty on the part of our officials in their dealings with the people.

That was a rather strong statement to say that officials were not honest with the people and to say Mr. Bowles and Judge Vinson conspired to swindle the people.

The gentleman from Minnesota further states:

I am not in the habit of saying, "I told you so," but on May 5, 1944, I made a speech in the House on Politics in Rationing in which I predicted: "I am convinced that should the New Deal elect its fourth term candidate on November 7, the O. P. A. will shortly thereafter, reinstate and make more drastic all rationing policies to further regiment and socialize the economy of our country." My prophecy has now become a reality.

It is reprehensible for those in charge of our Government to continue deceiving the people, and for initiating vital economic policies for political purposes. We want the truth about the war and also in regard to

policies governing our lives and domestic economy.

In the first place the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota is incorrect in the second paragraph because there were discussions between the War Food Administration, O. P. A. and the Economic Stabilizer before that order went into effect.

Paragraph 2 also is incorrect in its implication that there are no food shortages.

There will be no over-all shortage of foods, but certain rationed foods will be very short. Here is the expectation:

Sugar: 10 percent under 1944 supplies.
Meat: First quarter in 1945, less by 10 to 15 percent than same quarter in 1944.
Butter: Less than in 1944.

Canned vegetables: Supply on hand December 1, 1944, for civilians, 56 percent less than December 1, 1943. Both had to last until new crop was canned.

In paragraphs 4 and 5 it is implied that politics guided O. P. A.'s actions.

BOWLES CHOSE COURSE THAT LED TO CRITICISM

If ever action taken by the head of a Government agency was not guided by political considerations, it was this action of Chester Bowles in canceling outstanding ration stamps. He knew he would be criticized bitterly by many persons, like the gentleman from Minnesota, if he canceled the stamps. He knew if he did not do so that there would not be fair distribution of scarce foods in 1945; but that probably few persons would know things could be better. But, he deliberately chose the course that led to criticism because it was the only way to distribute fairly short supplies of foods in 1945.

Many of the heads of outstanding women's organizations of the country endorsed O. P. A.'s stand in restoring rationing to meats and processed foods and canceling stamps to make the action effective. No woman's organization to my knowledge has criticized O. P. A.'s action, although individual women have done so.

Here are women's organizations endorsing O. P. A.'s stand:

American Association of University Women.

League of Women Shoppers.

National Consumers' League.

National Council of Jewish Women.

C. I. O. women's auxiliaries.

National Council of Negro Women.

National Federation of Settlements—Consumer Interest Committee.

Parent-teacher associations.

National Women's Trade Union League.

The total membership in the above associations is over 9,500,000 women.

Is it in behalf of these women that the gentleman from Minnesota complains? If so, they have repudiated his position in advance. They are behind Mr. Bowles in the action he has taken.

CONGRESSMAN FROM MINNESOTA AND FULTON LEWIS, JR., BRING SERIOUS CHARGES

Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, has been charged by the gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and by Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio news com-

mentator, with swindling American housewives by cancelation of outstanding ration stamps issued prior to last December.

This was a very grave charge, as I have said. So I took the trouble to investigate. I wish to report the result.

Last year, due to a large livestock population, a large pack of canned vegetables and fruits, and expectation of early end of the European war, rationing was removed from most meats and processed foods by order of the Office of Economic Stabilization upon recommendation of the War Food Administration.

This step made rationing of remaining meats and processed foods very difficult for the Office of Price Administration. Most families could get along without using any of most foods retaining point values. If points were placed too high people would get along without them and points would accumulate in consumers' hands. But the same thing would happen if points were placed very low. O. P. A. adopted a fairly liberal policy. Points did accumulate in the hands of the public.

They accumulated not alone for this reason, but because points had to be adjusted to give needed rations to families of adults living in big cities and in no position to raise any of their own food. This meant that rural families, producing at least part of their meat supply and canning their own fruits and vegetables, had stamps they did not need. Many of their surplus stamps never were used. In some cases these were transferred to city friends, giving the latter a surplus.

By these and other ways a large surplus of unspent ration points accumulated during 1944 in the hands of consumers.

A survey made to determine as of November the number of unspent ration stamps in consumers' hands showed approximately 10,000,000,000 red and 26,000,000,000 blue points, and stamps for 281,000,000 pounds of sugar.

These were equal, roughly, to 2½ or 3 months' supply of meats, butter, and other red-point foods; 4 months' supply of canned goods and other processed foods, and 2 months' supply of sugar for home use, including canning.

The supply of unused stamps, moreover, had been accumulating rapidly, after most meats and processed foods were removed from rationing. As of the end of the year, unused stamps probably represented close to 3 months' supply of many foods.

Armed with that many unused points consumers could have bought up at one throw the Nation's supply of rationed foods required to last 2½ to 3 months. Obviously this would have resulted in serious disruption of food distribution.

The survey showed, moreover, that outstanding points were very unevenly distributed. Some families of adults living in cities and producing none of their own food had no surplus stamps. But other families had upward to a 6-month supply. There could be no assurance of equitable distribution of short supplies of rationed foods in 1945 so long as outstanding stamps remained valid.

There was reason to believe that there would be no extensive hardship if the

stamps were canceled. Those who had accumulated them had not required the average use of stamps in 1944. They probably would not need the average use of stamps in 1945. Certainly few of them would require in 1945 a 2½ or 3 months greater supply than other people.

Mr. Bowles freely admits that O. P. A. made a mistake in 1944, allowing these unspent stamps to accumulate, even though the situation, for reasons earlier explained, was difficult to control.

But whatever is one's opinion regarding the mistakes of 1944, these facts were true: The Nation faced short supplies of rationed foods for 1945 and unspent ration stamps totaled billions of points. There was one and only one thing to do if these short supplies were to be distributed fairly in 1945. That was to cancel the outstanding stamps.

Mr. Bowles knew when he ordered cancellation that it would stir up a storm of protest. That he faced the criticism and did what was required in the public interest deserves commendation and not criticism. It was statesmanship of the highest order.

Fortunately, his position is being supported vigorously by the women of America, contrary to the implications of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and Fulton Lewis, Jr.

If they had wanted to take the easy road they would have permitted these rationing coupons to have remained alive, although the shelves would have been empty pretty soon after the 1st of January of everything available to eat. Yet nobody could have blamed Mr. Bowles or Mr. Vinson. They were issued and they could have said, "We let them go ahead and let them clean out the shelves. We could not help it." It did require in this case courageous action on the part of honest, conscientious public officials to take the stand they did take in order to do what was necessary to properly prosecute the war and to protect the civilian population here at home.

FOOD AS IMPORTANT AS BULLETS

I agree with what has been said here today about the importance of food in the winning of the war. Next to air, food is next in importance. May I say, too, that the farmers have done a magnificent job in this war. They have been handicapped by shortage of manpower, equipment, machinery, and everything else, yet last year they increased their production 25 percent. It is a wonderful and an outstanding record. Food is just as important as bullets because if we do not have food the soldiers cannot use the bullets.

MR. JUSTICE BYRNES

I do not know the over-all picture concerning the great need for men in the armed services but I have confidence in Mr. Justice Byrnes. In my opinion, he is one of the greatest, the finest, and best men that we have ever had in our Government. He has made a great sacrifice in order to take the thankless job he is doing today. Here is a man who served in this House with distinction for many years and in the United States

Senate as long as he wanted to remain there. He was then appointed and served as a member of the United States Supreme Court, a position that pays twice as much as is paid a Member of Congress, if you want to look at it from the standpoint of security. The members of the Supreme Court can retire and have \$20,000 a year retirement benefit. So far as security and a good job are concerned, he had the very best job in this Nation. Yet he was willing to resign from that position and come down here and take a job in the White House that paid less than one-half as much, with no future security and nothing in the world except a thankless job to perform. However, he has the consolation of knowing he is doing something to help win this war by helping the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we should be very reluctant to criticize the actions of a man like that unless we have very positive proof that will support and corroborate everything we say.

Now, on the question of points, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] said that the women's organizations, as I understood from his statement, were supporting him. A commentator, Mr. Fulton Lewis, mentioned on the radio how bad this was and how the women were up in arms against it.

MR. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

MR. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not make the statement that the women's organizations were supporting me. Fulton Lewis may have done that.

MR. PATMAN. I am glad to have the statement from the gentleman, because I believe the gentleman would have been in error if he had made the statement. The women's organizations who have representatives right here in Washington who understand the situation approve it 100 percent, and I refer to organizations such as the American Association of University Women, the League of Women Shoppers, the National Consumers League, and a number of others, including the Parent-Teachers Association. They have all endorsed the action of Mr. Bowles and Mr. Vinson. They say it was the right thing to do and they represent nine and one-half million women in the United States.

MR. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

MR. JENKINS. Has the gentleman any proof of the statement he has just made?

MR. PATMAN. Yes.

MR. JENKINS. I will be glad if the gentleman would include it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks.

PARENTS AND TEACHERS ASSOCIATION APPROVES

MR. PATMAN. I will read it to the gentleman. I have a letter here. The following is a letter from Mrs. William A. Hastings, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers:

The homemakers of this country, in overwhelming majority, are glad to cooperate in some tangible way with their men in service in meeting the needs of these critical months.

Giving up ration stamps that have accumulated these past few months because so many foods have been point free and could be purchased in any desired quantity is no real sacrifice to anyone who understands the situation. If some of us let our stamps accumulate, it was because we did not really need to use them. Without them, even now that so many foods are back on the ration list, we can still feed our children well and still share with the children of our allies.

Ever since the beginning of the war, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, with more than 3,000,000 members, has believed in food rationing, because it is the fair and just way in which to give everyone his fair share of available foods. We believe in ceiling prices for foods, with price ceilings posted in plain view and with shoppers pledged to pay no more than ceiling prices. This is self-protection, for we know that inflation in food prices would be disastrous to the family budget and so to the national well-being.

We have cooperated with the O. P. A. consistently ever since it came into being. We know what a difficult task it has, and we expect to continue to cooperate.

We would deplore any weakening of O. P. A.'s program as long as it is necessary for us to share our food supplies with our men in service and with the suffering people of the war-torn countries. There is enough food for all of us if we are careful in its distribution and no one uses any more than his fair share.

This is an easy way in which the soldiers on the home front can back up those on the battle fronts.

Mrs. WILLIAM A. HASTINGS,
President, National Congress
of Parents and Teachers.
MADISON, WIS., January 7, 1945.

Here is another one by Mrs. LaSelle Dickenson, of the General Federation of Women's Clubs:

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is strongly back of the principles of rationing and price control. We realize it is not always easy to see the reason behind action, but we have confidence that those in power are doing the very best they can to see that food supplies are sent to our armies, to our allies, and that sufficient is left here at home for all.

We also realize and appreciate the effort that is being made to keep prices down. We will try to do our part in every way to prevent inflation.

Mrs. LASELLE DICKENSON.

Here is one from Helen C. White, president, American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C., dated January 6, 1945:

The American Association of University Women, which has supported price control since long before Pearl Harbor and has backed rationing throughout the war, recognizes that the necessity for strong price control and strict rationing will be greater than ever in the months ahead.

At this time, when the need for unremitting effort to speed victory is so great, I want to reiterate the full support of the American Association of University Women for these programs. Our members will continue to cooperate in making price control, rent control, and rationing work in their communities and will stand back of O. P. A. in its measures to hold the line on price and to distribute short supplies equitably. We are confident that O. P. A. will continue to carry out its increasingly important and difficult task vigorously, and will take measures which are fundamentally fair even when they may happen to bear hard upon individual cases. We shall support the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act through the remainder of the war and so long as the threat of inflation lasts.

Caroline F. Ware, chairman, national social studies committee, American Association of University Women:

Far from protesting the restoration of meats and canned vegetables to rationing, consumer organizations have been asking for this action since these products were made point free. As soon as the new program was announced, 15 national organizations, representing millions of consumers, telegraphed Chester Bowles, Marvin Jones, and Judge Vinson to commend their action.

Kathleen Clift, president of the Washington League of Women Shoppers:

I believe that the vast majority of all housewives want everybody to share alike when supplies are short. Especially those of us with husbands in the service resent the charge that we want to grab more than our share. It is our job to adjust our buying for our families' needs within the ration points issued to us on the basis of available supplies each month.

Margaret Cross, head of consumer interest committee of the National Federation of Settlements:

City housewives who belong to the mothers' clubs at our settlements aren't worried about old coupons. They only have the money and storage space to buy for their weekly needs, they are absolutely dependent on what they find in the stores, and they know that rationing is their only protection.

Mrs. Gerson P. Levi, national chairman of social welfare and war activities, National Council of Jewish Women:

Any annoyance that our housewives may have shown is temporary and has arisen because women who have been anxious to have rationing restored to canned goods and meats didn't at first fully understand why it was necessary to invalidate old coupons. The O. P. A. broadcast last night made it clear that this was much the fairest thing to do, since people who did not use the old coupons either did not need them or patriotically refrained from drawing on the limited supplies, and since it means more for all of us not to have to save part of the sugar, meat, and canned goods for the people with leftover stamps.

Mrs. William A. Hastings, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers:

Giving up ration stamps that have accumulated these past few months because so many foods have been point free and could be purchased in any desired quantity is no real sacrifice to anyone who understands the situation. If some of us let our stamps accumulate, it was because we did not really need to use them. Without them, even now that so many foods are back on the ration list, we can still feed our children well and still share with the children of our allies.

Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs:

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is strongly back of the principle of rationing and price control. We realize it is not always easy to see the reason behind action—but we have confidence that those in power are doing the very best they can to see that food supplies are sent to our armies, to our allies, and that sufficient is left here at home for all.

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, I have no way to impugn the honesty and the sincerity of these letters, but I dare say that none of them have been written after submission of this proposition to their membership and if they have been, I should like the ladies that put those in

to furnish the gentleman with information whether or not they wrote these letters with the full approval of their membership. I doubt it very seriously.

Mr. PATMAN. Whether they did or not, they did the right thing and doubtless expressed the views of their members. I believe in the patriotism of every Member of this House. I shall not question or impugn the motives or the patriotism or sincerity of purpose of any Member of this House. I never have and never will.

But let us just analyze this thing a little bit. There were a lot of foodstuffs made ration free. Some meats you had to have points for; some you did not have to have points for. The same way with canned goods. By reason of that, many people did not use their points because they could buy the meats they wanted without them. It was just as satisfactory and just as desirable without points. Therefore, they just let their points accumulate. On January 1, if it had remained that way, there were enough points outstanding for people to go in and take all the food that was available, not only on the shelves at that time, but that could be produced in 3 long months. Now, what would that have meant?

That would have meant that possibly our 12,000,000 men upon the 55 battle fronts of the world and here at home would not have gotten the finest and best food on earth, because it would not have been available. That is one of the reasons for rationing, No. 1, to let every one of those 12,000,000 men, who, by the way, have to have just twice as much as the average civilian—he averages 5½ pounds of food every day, 4,500 calories, twice as much as we can consume; that is, over 65,000,000 pounds of the finest and best foods on earth every day must be set aside for these fighting men. If we let this thing go on, if Mr. Bowles or Mr. Vinson had done so, possibly they could not have gotten the required amount. We would have been depriving our servicemen of the foods that are necessary to fight this war.

No. 2, a few people would have had these points. Other people who had used theirs would not have had a fair chance to obtain the kind of food that would keep up their health standards in this country. Further, every time we furnish food to China or to Russia and they take that food and go out and kill Japs or Germans, there are just that many fewer Japs and Germans to kill American boys. I do not think the people who study this program and who know the sincerity of purpose, without any politics whatsoever but in the interest of the war effort and the domestic front, can criticize the program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the time last summer when approximately 85 percent of the rationed foods were put on the free list, the O. P. A. reduced the number of stamps from 60 a month to 30 a month, and still left butter on the rationed list and placed the point

value on butter at 20 points, so that if a person wanted to get a pound of butter a month there were only a few points left to spend on other rationed foods.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not doubt that the gentleman can pick out a lot of complaints. I marvel at the fine job they have done. They have 8,000,000 different commodities and prices. The O. P. A. has a good chance to make mistakes and will make lots of them. The gentleman could not have done a better job, probably. I know I could not. You take 8,000,000 different things and you can point out a lot of things to criticize, but this is war. We are in war now. We are trying to fight a war. We should have just as little partisan politics as possible. Criticism, certainly, if it is constructive, but just to criticize and raise sand with somebody for doing his duty sincerely and honestly, I think we ought to be very reluctant to do it unless it serves a very good purpose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to the large accumulation of ration stamps. I was not criticizing from a partisan angle on that point, but the gentleman knows that when they reduced the ration stamps and still some necessary foods were under rationing, by reducing it down to 30 points a month there were not very many stamps with which to buy butter and other rationed foods.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going to argue the details of it. It is just like gasoline. Suppose we had had some kind of fuel that could have been used in the place of gasoline, a substitute, and we let our gasoline coupons accumulate to January 1 and we had had enough gasoline, we had not been doing without, we had been getting everything that we wanted, our transportation had not been cut, we had been going along all right, just like we were on the food. We were getting just as good food as we wanted, but our points were accumulating. Then suppose on January 1 there had been enough gasoline coupons so that the people who would use the gasoline for purposes not essential could just go in and drain every tank in America and keep them drained for 3 months, and not let anybody else get any gasoline. Does the gentleman think that should be permitted? No. Would it be breaking faith? In wartime things like that are expected, just like your travel. You want to travel, but if Mr. Byrnes says you should not travel, you have your ticket, you have the money, and you have everything, but you are going to stay at home. That is no violation of any contract in wartime, that is just working together shoulder to shoulder and cooperating, trying to win this war.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I understood the gentleman to make the statement a moment ago that if these meat ration points had been allowed to stand civilian consumption would possibly have used up the supply of meat that was available and thereby created a shortage for the armed services.

Mr. PATMAN. I am talking about food generally.

Mr. PLOESER. I know, but did not the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. PATMAN. I said food generally; yes.

Mr. PLOESER. I understood him to say meat.

Mr. PATMAN. For food generally, that is true.

Mr. PLOESER. In the case of meat it could not have happened that way, because the Army sets aside the amount of meat it wants before the civilian population ever gets a chance at it.

Mr. PATMAN. Anyway, I think rationing is a fine thing in wartime. I would not want it in time of peace unless absolutely necessary.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I answer the gentleman from Missouri? Not only is it a matter of obtaining the necessary food for the armed forces, the necessary meat for the armed forces, but it is a matter of distributing equitably that which is left among the people of the country.

Mr. PATMAN. It would have been unfair, absolutely and obviously unfair to let a few people accumulate their points and use them under the circumstances without losing anything and to the detriment of the other people. They were getting everything on earth they needed, getting all the food they wanted. They were just not buying that particular kind that required points. If they could go in on January 1 and buy up everything in the stores of America and have enough points to keep on buying stuff for 2.8 months, approximately 3 months, that would certainly have worked a hardship on a lot of people. I think that is obvious. I do not think one should be branded with swindling the people, with being swindlers and conspiring to defraud the public, when they do something that is obviously a courageous act in wartime, to help promote the war.

Mr. PLOESER. I have never accused Mr. Bowles of swindling nor did I condemn him for that move.

However, I do recall saying that the move was a blunder.

Mr. PATMAN. No; you are mistaken. I am glad you brought that up.

Mr. PLOESER. I read that in the press.

Mr. PATMAN. I know you read it; and the newspaper would not even correct it. Here is a copy of that newspaper of January 4, 1945. It is the Times-Herald here in Washington, D. C. It says:

STAMP VOIDING "ERROR," BOWLES—BLAMES SURVEY FOR CHRISTMAS MISTAKE

NEW YORK, January 3.—A flat admission that we were wrong was made by O. P. A. Administrator Bowles today in reference to the Christmas cancellations of various unused sugar and red-and-blue-point ration stamps.

However, he added, the mistake could not be rectified without hardship to a majority of the people.

Speaking at a luncheon of the marketing conference of the American Management Association, Bowles attributed the mistake to a preliminary survey in which, he said, a ma-

jority of housewives said they did not need their unused stamps.

"We were wrong. We should have foreseen these possibilities. However, I was not willing to cover that mistake by working a hardship on the great majority who need their stamps to get their fair share of food," Bowles said.

It is not true. Mr. Bowles did not say it. He said the error was made long before January 1 when they did not anticipate what might happen. He said they had to do it; that it was the right thing to do, but they committed the error along back possibly last spring and summer in not anticipating that this thing would occur. I hope that is straight. I will include a copy of that statement and also of Mr. Bowles' speech since I have permission to do so. Here I insert that part of the speech referred to:

We placed back on the list of rationed products 85 percent of all meats sold in the average grocery store. We restored five canned vegetables to rationing. The invalidation of ration stamps was one of the toughest decisions we have ever had to make. When we originally said there would be notification in the case of invalidation of stamps we did not estimate properly the number of unused stamps which would accumulate nor the serious effect the spending of these stamps could have on reduced supplies.

We were wrong. We should have foreseen these possibilities.

However, I was not willing to cover that mistake by working a hardship on the large majority who need their stamps to get their fair share of food.

It shows how information will be printed which is not true. Now, of course, the gentleman honestly believed that. I know the gentleman. He is a good and sincere Member of this body and he is very able. He has been misled by that statement. If he has been misled I know other Members have been misled also. But it is not true. This newspaper was told that it was not true and they refused and failed to correct it. I am inserting Mr. Bowles' own comment about this speech and the misquotation. It is as follows:

This is the speech for which I was misquoted by one of the papers you may have seen. That paper attributed to me a "flat admission that 'we were wrong' in reference to the Christmas cancellation of various unused sugar and red and blue point ration stamps." As you will see on the first page of this attached statement, the phrase "we were wrong" refers to our estimate of the number of unused stamps which would accumulate and the serious effect which the spending of such stamps could have on reduced supplies.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. If it be true that Mr. Bowles admits the error last summer, then it is confirmation probably of the many statements I have heard that the relaxing of rationing was due to the impending election. I would much rather believe that the error was one of accident this winter.

JONES, VINSON, BYRNES, AND BOWLES

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment. Mr. Bowles is not the only man to be consulted in this. Other people were to be consulted, such as Mr. Vinson, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Byrnes, as well as Mr. Bowles.

If you want to inject a political question here I might point out that there are more Republicans in high positions in the O. P. A. than there are Democrats, and you will find the same thing in the W. P. B. and in all these different war agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now that the question of the election has been injected into the debate here, I might say that the O. P. A. and none of the officials in any way participated in the election, and Mr. Bowles never made a speech.

Mr. PATMAN. He made a statement advising them to stay out. No one can accuse the O. P. A. or Mr. Bowles of taking part in the election.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it was right because there are tens of thousands of fine citizens in every community serving on the board in connection with the O. P. A. These men and women belong to both parties and some are independents, and it would have been a wrong and reflection on them and on the fine service that they have rendered. You ought to commend them, because they have a hard job. So reluctantly I am constrained to take that position, because I would like to see them out campaigning. But I think, having in mind his job and the relationship of his agency to the people and to the many people who are in that agency in an unpaid capacity, I believe that he exercised the right judgment in the best interest of the country.

Mr. PATMAN. Not only do we have Mr. Justice Byrnes there, in whom we all have confidence, but there is Fred Vinson. We all have confidence in Fred Vinson, who left a Federal judgeship, resigned, to take a thankless and hard job to do something for his country in wartime. That is No. 2. No. 3 is Marvin Jones. There is no fairer man in this country than Marvin Jones. He is a United States district judge. That not being a statutory court, he did not have to resign. But he wants to do the job of a good War Food Administrator, and he does it without any salary, in order to help win this war. Then there is Mr. Bowles. I do not know of any public official who is serving with greater credit to the administration and for the benefit of the people generally than Mr. Bowles. If he makes a mistake, he comes out frankly and says so. He says, "We will correct it." That is what we have always wanted in administrative agencies. He is doing a good job in a fine way. Out of the millions and millions of transactions, there are a few, which are so small in number that you can count them almost on the fingers of your hands, that some critics will attempt to criticize.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not doubt the sincerity of the statement of my distinguished friend from Texas, nor of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. PATMAN. Now I hope that this is going to be a question.

Mr. PLOESER. No; I want to make this statement in reply to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. PATMAN. All right, go ahead.

Mr. PLOESER. Surely he does not believe that any of us are naive enough to assume that the criticism was placed on thousands of people who worked for the O. P. A. Neither does he believe that any of us are naive enough to assume that the thousands of people who work and labor carrying out the rules of the O. P. A. are the top policy makers nor would he ever expect any of us of the minority to assume that if the great political strategist of the administration sent down word to relax rationing in time for an election that even Mr. Bowles would stand in the way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's gesture of innocence, political or otherwise, is rather refreshing although not very impressive. Let me call to the gentleman's attention one incident as an illustration of what the President and this administration stand for. The invasion of Africa took place 2 days after the election of 1942. That is the best illustration I know of that politics is not entering into questions of strategy in the conduct of the war or questions of policy and administration. Mistakes may be made, but politics does not enter into it. Had that invasion taken place 2 days before election in 1942 the entire situation might have been different.

Mr. PATMAN. And if the administration had been doing something purely for politics it would have probably been against all rationing and price control. I think the gentleman will admit it took some courage to enforce rationing and price control, but it was something that manifestly had to be done to save this country from inflation. If we had not had price control our money would be valueless today, would be practically worthless. It would take a wheelbarrow load to buy a newspaper or a loaf of bread. We can lose this war today on the home front if we permit inflation to engulf us. People will not work for worthless money. If we are so shortsighted as to be against price control, unpopular, annoying, and irritating as it is, we are liable to lose the war right here on the home front.

Mr. McCORMACK. I read in one of the New York papers this morning, I believe it was, where the cost of living in China was 485 times higher today than it was in 1937.

Mr. PATMAN. And our cargo planes that are carrying supplies over the mountains into China find half their cargo space filled with printing-press money. Imagine that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bowles did very properly send out in-

structions to all his employees that they must not engage in politics. I thought it was one of the finest acts of any administrator. And they refrained from politics. As our majority leader said, it was fitting that they do so, because so many people who have different views from the administration in power were doing a splendid and excellent job on all these thousands of boards throughout the country and there was no place for any kind of partisan politics. This is one agency that no one can claim violated that rule; they did not. There are fine people on both sides of the political fence in the O. P. A. organization. As I said before, over half of the policy-making positions in O. P. A. and W. P. B. are filled with members of the opposite party from me; and they are doing an excellent job, all of them; they have been doing a fine job. I could pick out things to criticize, but they have been doing an excellent job, and they should not be criticized for doing it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Just for the record I should like to ask the gentleman what was the date of this mistake? How long was it prior to November 7?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about this. The gentleman can find out as well as I. Let us go into this thing with an open mind. These officials are not going to steal or swindle. The facts are available if the gentleman wants to investigate them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that if we had had O. P. A. in the last war the country might have been saved from the subsequent depression?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly we would have been. That depression ruined more people than any other period of time in our history. In this war O. P. A. has fixed the price not only of foods, but they have fixed the price of steel. Steel has not gone up 1 penny a ton in 5 years. The price of aluminum has not gone up a penny a ton in 5 years. So with the price of copper, except for the subsidies that we paid. Plate glass, cement, and other things that go into making this war machine: If the prices had been permitted to go up during this war the same way they went up during the same period of time in the last war our national debt on June 30 last would have been \$65,000,000,000 more than it was, just on the cost of the war machine alone not counting the amount the American people have saved for themselves. So it is something that is important.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition there would have been the tremendous damage done to the people of the middle class and the poor if we did not have the rationing system in operation that we have, which is the democratic way of assuring, as nearly as possible, equal distribution of

the available food when the available food is much less than the demand; is that not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is right. Our health standards would have been broken down. It would have been very unfair for this Congress to sit idly by and see people with money going around hoarding food like they did in the First World War, depriving many people of the United States of the necessary food to go into their diet. The question of health is involved in this. During the present war we have had a limited supply of food in some cases, but it has been distributed so that every person has a chance to get a fair share of it. The health standards of the people, therefore, have been kept up. The other war did not last long enough to permit inflation to ruin us. If it had lasted longer it would have ruined us. People with money went in and bought up commodities like sugar and made the American people pay from 35 cents to 50 cents a pound for that sugar because there was no price control. In this war, under price control, sugar has not gone over 7 cents a pound. That is the best evidence that price control has been successful and has been satisfactory and I think we should be careful about charging those who are enforcing the law and administering it with being swindlers and trying to deceive the American people. Of course, constructive criticism is always welcome if there is anything wrong, but let us be careful in wartime when our sons are serving in the Army all over the world. You know, the sun does not set on the American soldier today. They are serving on 55 battle fronts. There are 6,000,000 of them across the seas. Now is no time to engage in any kind of criticism except the most constructive, helpful type of criticism. It is easy to criticize. It is difficult to construct. I wish I knew who wrote the following:

THE WRECKER

I watched them tear a building down,
A gang of men in a busy town.
With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell
They swung a beam and the side wall fell.
I asked the foreman: "Are these men skilled?
And the kind of men you hire to build?"
He laughed as he answered: "No indeed,
Just common labor is all I need."
"Why I can easily wreck in a day or two
What builders have taken years to do."
Now think for yourself as you go away,
Which of these roles have you played today.
Is that one a builder, who works with care,
Shaping his deeds with rule and square?
Or is he a wrecker, who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I take the gentleman back to his original defense of this rule and say to him that I thank the gentleman cordially for bringing to us this story of the patriotic women or groups of women who back him up. The women I saw did not talk that way. They say that the Government welshed on its promise so far as these rationing points were concerned.

Mr. PATMAN. But the gentleman should talk to women who have sons in this war and who have studied this thing. You talk to the women who have husbands in this war and who have studied this thing.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have heard them talk.

Mr. PATMAN. Talk to the people who know. I hope the gentleman, in whom I have confidence, will investigate for himself.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course, I do not understand the thing like the gentleman does, I appreciate and I acknowledge that, but I have heard them talk, great groups of them and the point was that the Government had welshed on its promise that these stamps would be good indefinitely. They were not using those stamps, neither would they use them all on January 1 to denude the market. Now they are using what stamps they have to denude the market for fear the Government will go back on its agreement. The situation has brought about exactly what the gentleman condemns as happening on January 1.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman had been the Administrator and he had this situation facing him what would he have done? As to whether or not it should have been anticipated in the past, that is behind us, and our hindsight is always better than our foresight. We had a practical situation facing us of either letting the shelves be emptied and no food available at all except for those people who had saved up their points, or canceling the points and letting everybody have a fair chance at the limited supply of food.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not criticize the Administrator.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman does not criticize him.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think he was mighty shrewd to wait until after the election though.

Mr. PATMAN. I think he was mighty courageous.

Mr. GIFFORD. He knew of this.

Mr. PATMAN. He was courageous.

Mr. GIFFORD. He must have known of it.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think the gentleman should say that everything is politics.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman says there is no politics in this?

Mr. PATMAN. It took courage to do this. The political side would have been the side the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gifford] does not know that the election is over.

Mr. GIFFORD. No; but we have been defending a lot of subversive people here today.

Mr. PATMAN. I am inserting herewith the speech of Mr. Bowles heretofore referred to. It tells the whole story:

I am very glad of an opportunity to speak to the members of the American Management Association here in New York City. I'd like to use this opportunity to tell you about some of the management and policy problems we must solve if we are to win our wartime struggle to hold the price line and assure fair distribution of scarce supplies.

There are five major problems which we must lick if we are to win this fight.

O. P. A. problem No. 1 involves food rationing. A week ago today we announced a series of fundamental changes in our food-rationing system. We invalidated surplus sugar stamps covering over 250,000 tons of sugar. We invalidated nearly 17,000,000,000 blue ration points, covering processed foods; and over 10,000,000,000 red points covering meats, fats, and oils.

We placed back on the list of rationed products 85 percent of all meats sold in the average grocery store. We restored five canned vegetables to rationing. The invalidation of ration stamps was one of the toughest decisions we've ever had to make. When we originally said there would be notification in the case of invalidation of stamps, we did not estimate properly the number of unused stamps which would accumulate nor the serious effect the spending of these stamps could have on reduced supplies.

We were wrong. We should have foreseen these possibilities.

However, I was not willing to cover that mistake by working a hardship on the large majority who need their stamps to get their fair share of food.

Our choice was simply this: First, we could allow the old stamps to remain valid and cut the value of the new stamps. Or, second, we could cancel the old stamps and give everyone his fair share of 1945 supplies. The first plan would have allowed one comparatively small group of families a substantially larger share of 1945 supplies than the majority of families. That would have been unfair.

When we asked women who had extra stamps why they had not spent them, the large majority told us, "Because we didn't need them." Most of them, I am sure, will tell you that it would be unfair to cut the rations of those who have to spend their stamps promptly in order to allow an extra share of scarce food to others who were able to save stamps when food was more plentiful. It was a hard decision. We knew some people would be mad, and with many of them I really sympathize. That is no reason, however, why we should not insist on a fair share of 1945 supplies to each household . . . particularly when the supplies of these foods are lower than they have been at any time during the war.

Very frankly, these changes in our food-rationing program, unwelcome though they be, could not be postponed longer.

It was evident that meat supplies were likely to be substantially below last year's level. We knew that billions of unused sugar stamps and blue ration points, representing inflationary ration currency, were a threat to the proper working of our whole food-rationing program. We knew that the supply of canned foods allotted to civilians was unlikely to be sufficient to meet civilian demand.

The food requirements of the armed forces must be met. The guns in Europe are still roaring today and all of us realize that we are up against a tough struggle both in Europe and in Asia.

In many sections of the country, meat has been scarce. Distribution has been dangerously uneven. Three weeks ago, for example, 35 percent of all stores were out of butter; 45 percent were out of ham; 66 percent were out of bacon.

The Army's meat requirements have increased sharply. For the coming 3 months there will be 15 percent less meat available for civilians than we had a year ago.

We are faced with the problem of distributing very carefully our available supply of canned vegetables for civilian use until the new pack is completed next summer.

Needless to say, the decision to restore more rigid food rationing was not an easy one. We dislike the necessity for additional

red tape and inconvenience to our housewives and grocers.

But facts are facts. And in wartime in particular, they must be met honestly and fairly. The food rationing program which we launched last week will serve, over a period of time, to see that every family in the land gets a fair share of meat, canned vegetables, and sugar. If we had failed to meet this issue squarely, we would have failed to carry out the responsibility with which we have been entrusted.

So much for the policy aspects of the rationing situation.

I think you may be interested, however, as management specialists, in the administrative problems of carrying out such a policy decision. Let me list some of them.

There are 8 O. P. A. regional offices, 93 district offices, and about 5,500 local O. P. A. boards—each one of which has to be given instructions for applying and interpreting the regulations.

There are about 8,000 wholesalers and 600,000 retailers of meats, processed vegetables, or sugar. Each one of these has to be notified of the basic decisions and provided with a poster showing the point values to be charged for each type of rationed food.

There are some 550,000 hotels, restaurants, and other institutional users of rationed foods, including schools, hospitals, asylums, and jails. Each one of these has to prepare ration-point inventories by the end of the year.

In addition, there is the problem of issuing new quotas to about 125,000 industrial users of rationed food products.

Moreover, there are about 1,500 newspapers and radio stations to be notified of the essentials of the program so that the buying public and food retailers may suffer as little inconvenience as possible.

Finally, in the case of rationing changes, there is the special problem of maintaining complete secrecy while making preparations to carry out the administrative details. The printing of instructions and regulations, the notification of field offices, the necessary consultation with specialists in different parts of the Washington office and with officers of other agencies involve so many people that the maintenance of secrecy is very difficult indeed. And yet, if we are to avoid advance buying of newly rationed items or more tightly rationed commodities, it is essential that there be no advance notice to the general public. We have never succeeded in doing a 100-percent perfect job.

On several occasions we have had to advance the effective date of ration changes because leaks had already occurred. Naturally, this leads to confusion, since we are then not able to put out the necessary instructions on time. However, during the last 3 years, we have all learned a good deal about the administrative details of rationing. The public is much better informed. The trades involved are very cooperative, and our own specialists have been trained in the hard school of experience. We can look forward, I think, to a much smoother operation of all rationing programs in the future.

O. P. A. problem No. 2, for which we shall have to find some solution, is control over livestock prices. For many months now, live cattle has been almost the only basic commodity, either agricultural or manufacturing, on which there has been no price ceiling.

We have encountered difficulties in administering ceiling prices at wholesale and retail levels because the price of the original product is not under control. But control over livestock prices involves serious technical difficulties. In tightening controls over the top prices in livestock, we would be taking a step which, to many cattle raisers, would seem to be a drastic one. There is considerable resistance to it.

We in the O. P. A. have felt for a long time that such controls are inevitable. If the authority should be delegated to us by the Stabilization Director, we would act promptly. We feel we would be better protecting the public against overcharges at the retail level. But, again, it will be a tough decision, and it would not be an easy program to manage.

Since the quality of beef cannot be accurately graded on the hoof, it has to be graded after slaughtering. There are about 20,000 slaughterers, ranging from very small operations, employing a few men, to the huge, integrated companies making the fullest possible use of all byproducts. These slaughterers must be inspected by a very limited staff of skilled people. The specialized knowledge required for proper inspection and grading of dressed beef takes many years to acquire.

In addition to the slaughterers, there are about 10,000 meat wholesalers and more than 500,000 meat retail outlets. Compliance with ceiling prices at each level of distribution must be achieved if the consumer is to be protected at retail. If there are violations at any level of distribution, it produces squeezes at later levels which make the elimination of black markets extremely difficult, if not impossible.

To secure compliance with retail ceiling prices, more than a million meat price charts to organize and administer the work of price for different price zones have to be prepared and distributed in retail stores and to the price panels of local boards. Members of price panels must be recruited and trained panel assistants who help butchers abide by price regulations and take care of reported violations.

Success in carrying out this tremendous management task depends, to a very large extent, upon the understanding and cooperation of both the trade and the housewife. This, in turn, involves an information program to trade associations, trade papers, general newspapers, and consumer organizations.

It's not an impossible job, but we're going to have our hands full.

O. P. A. problem No. 3, to which we must find a fair and practical answer lies in our pricing policy as it applies to the distributive trades: sales agents, jobbers, wholesalers, and retailers. In justice to the consumer and to other segments of our economy, I believe we have no alternative but to apply the principle of cost absorption to the distributive trades we have so long applied to producers.

The Price Control Act states only that the ceiling prices set by the Office of Price Administration should be "generally fair and equitable." It was up to us to determine what these words mean in actual practice. To carry out the purpose of the act we established pricing standards which required the absorption of certain increases in cost before price increases were allowed. If it had not been for this principle the level of all prices would be far higher than it is today. We might well be headed toward a dangerous inflation.

In spite of the fact that we have insisted that manufacturers absorb increased costs as long as their over-all earnings were satisfactory, business in general has been far more prosperous than in any other period in the history of our country.

These principles of pricing were fully explained to Congress last spring. We spent many days before congressional committees with charts and graphs, explaining our standards for price increases both as a general matter of policy and in specific individual cases. Since Congress extended the act without any changes in these standards, it thereby expressed its approval of them. In a case decided in August, the Emergency Court of Appeals upheld their validity.

Even after reasonable cost absorption, however, price increases to manufacturers and

other producers are sometimes necessary according to these standards. When those occasions occur—and I hope they will not be too numerous—it seems only fair and just that we apply the same accepted, tested principle of cost absorption to wholesalers, retailers, and other distributors.

As in the case of other groups, the distributive trades have been very profitable during the war period. Large department stores on the average are making nearly seven times as much and small department stores are making about nine times as much on net sales as they were in 1936-39. The hardware retailers are making nearly three times as much on net sales as they did in 1936-39. The hardware wholesalers are making nearly twice as much. Greatly increased profits are also true of music stores, dry goods wholesalers, etc.

As long as these wartime profits remain high, it is only reasonable for the distributive trades to help share cost increases. It is only proper that the consumer should be protected against increases in the retail price on those occasions where some increase is necessary at the manufacturing level. The pricing standards which we have developed are, I believe, entirely fair. However long it takes to win the war our pricing standards will leave the distributive trades, with rare exceptions, in a more profitable position than they have ever been in peacetime.

Again, I believe there is no question of the rightness of our stand. And again I am confident that the vast majority of store owners, wholesalers, and other merchants will cooperate with us to the hilt. But there will be some, of course, who will attempt to apply pressure and who will complain bitterly even in wartime.

O. P. A. problem No. 4 lies in the clothing situation. Clothing, as you probably know, is the only one of the three principal items in the cost of living which has risen in the last year and a half. The level of average rents throughout the country is exactly where it was 30 months ago. The index of individual food prices, according to the Department of Labor, is actually 4.5 percent lower than in the spring of 1943.

But clothing prices have climbed steadily. The climb has been only a portion of the increases we had during the last war, when clothing prices increased more than 200 percent, but the price has risen steadily. The increase this time has amounted to something like 8 percent in the last 12 months. But this increase has bothered us a great deal and in fact has threatened our whole anti-inflation program.

We have been further disturbed by the deterioration in clothing quality and the disappearance of low-price lines. These difficult problems must be met. And again the solution is bound to be disturbing to some groups.

The War Production Board has already taken steps to eliminate or curtail the use of fabrics for nonessential purposes. W. P. B. is taking further steps to allocate fabrics to basic uses for which there is the greatest need.

The O. P. A. in turn has taken strong measures to eliminate overfinishing and overfancying of materials. We are now taking additional steps on finished clothing.

I am afraid some of the moves which we will make will not be greeted by cheers from some of those in the clothing field. But again, I can only point out that the production of textiles and the manufacture of clothing has been very profitable during the war. Already we are open to grave criticism for allowing prices in this field to rise even to the extent to which they have risen.

If we failed to correct this situation now, we would be failing to carry out a major part of our difficult wartime responsibility. I am sure the steps which we must take during the next 30 days to bring clothing prices and quality under better control will be

welcomed by consumers and will be conceded to be fair by all the responsible members of the textile and clothing industry.

It's not going to be easy, however, as I think you can judge from the administrative problems involved. There are 3,500 textile manufacturers; 650 converters of textiles; 5,500 wholesalers and jobbers; 1,900 apparel manufacturers and 200,000 retail clothing stores. The trade channels through which textiles and apparel move are probably more complex and varied than those of any other industry. New firms are constantly entering the field while others disappear.

Continual changes take place in style and in the actual processes of manufacture. There are few satisfactory quality standards to which specific prices can be attached. There is so little uniformity of business practice that it is very difficult to draft satisfactory general rules under which we can operate.

We must have fairly accurate information on which to base decisions. We cannot play by ear without becoming arbitrary. If we are to have information, questionnaires must be carefully prepared which will cause the least inconvenience to business. The results of these questionnaires must be put in usable form.

After general regulations have been drawn, there must be provision for meeting the particular circumstances of individuals or special groups. Thousands of applications have to be processed. New prices have to be set on new goods.

Compliance with regulations must be secured at each level of manufacture and distribution through the cooperation of the trade press, trade associations, and individual businessmen. Compliance meetings have to be organized, and permanent compliance committees set up.

Specialized information in the form of press releases and easily readable trade bulletins have to be prepared. Enforcement investigations have to be undertaken. Legal actions must be instituted and court cases presented.

For this stupendous job we have available two or three hundred price specialists, about 370 enforcement investigators and fewer than a hundred attorneys for the entire country.

It is pretty clear, therefore, that even though the original policy decisions may be tough, the actual administration of these decisions involves a good many headaches before the results begin to show up in the cost-of-living. Such a program can't be carried through without error, without strain, irritation, and difficulty. But I believe that every month we stay at this our efficiency improves. We're a lot better at it now than we were 2 or 3 years ago. And none of us will be content unless we can continue to show improvement.

Finally, on our list of O. P. A. problems, there is the question of reconversion pricing. When the happy day eventually comes when our factories once again hum with the manufacture of such consumer goods as automobiles, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, and radios, we shall be faced with the problem of reviewing ceiling prices in these fields—most of which reflect March 1942 prices.

Our policies in this field have already been stated on other occasions. Let me repeat them here. It is our belief, based on preliminary studies, that with relatively few exceptions the consumer durable items which have been off the market during the war years can again be placed on sale at the same prices which were charged the consumer during the first quarter of 1942.

There have, of course, been some increases in wage rates and some increases in raw material prices. But for all these products there will be an almost unlimited demand, once the war has been finally won. Big volume makes for lowered costs. Selling costs will also be

lower, and overhead charges will be reduced. We believe that these reduced costs will go a long way toward offsetting such increases in wage rates and material prices as there may have been. When cost increases cannot be absorbed by the manufacturers, we shall ask, within reason, that they be absorbed by those who distribute the product to the final consumer.

If we are to meet squarely our aim of a stable peacetime economy, if we are to hold the line vigorously and courageously against inflationary forces, retail prices on these products must be firmly held. This, I believe, can be accomplished with full allowance for generous profits, in most cases, to manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, and retailers.

Our American economy runs on the profit motive. A fair and just profit at all levels of production and trade should be maintained. But we must appreciate, too, that while some costs go up, other costs go down. And if we are really determined to control the forces of inflation we must be willing to forego the chance for inflationary profits, which, pleasant though they might be for the moment, could only lead to disaster.

I have listed just a few of our problems. Most of them are not easy. I can assure you that the handling of them is not a pleasant task. In seeking their solution we are certain to make some mistakes. In any such vast operation as this, some errors and some irritations are inevitable.

As I have said so many times before, we will work constantly to eliminate such mistakes as fast as they occur, and to provide the fairest possible administration of the law which Congress has placed in our charge.

We all know that wartime controls are difficult and unpleasant. But we will accept them, I believe with relative cheerfulness as long as we have reason to believe they will fulfill these objectives.

Can we actually hold inflation in check? Can we maintain a stable economy? Can we avoid the skyrocketing prices which historically have always gone with war? Frankly, I believe we can. But let me quickly add that I am not overconfident. So far our record has been reasonably good. The level of wholesale industrial prices is only 3 percent above the prices of 30 months ago, that is, the spring of 1942, when O. P. A. price control first went into effect. During the last 18 months the average of these prices have been held almost exactly even. That means millions upon millions of dollars already saved in the cost of fighting the war.

The cost of living since the first days of price control has increased only 9 percent. Since our O. P. A. controls have been perfected—that is, since the spring of 1943—the increase has been only 1 percent. As I pointed out, we have been weak on clothing, but that weakness has been largely offset by our record on food and rent. I believe that our new clothing program will put an end to price increases in the clothing field.

But we cannot afford to be overconfident. It would be folly to make promises in a field as difficult as this. We should remind ourselves that once before we met the problem and fumbled it rather dismally. After the defeat of Germany, in 1918, prices for a while fell off. From one end of the country to the other it was said that the danger of further inflation was over. But in March 1919 prices started upward, and a wild scramble for inventories developed. Prices rose higher and higher with wages tagging along behind. The white-collar worker—as usual—faced special difficulties.

In June 1920 the inflationary boom collapsed. In a single year \$11,000,000,000 in inventories were wiped out. Substantial business profits turned into losses. Net farm income dropped by 62 percent. Factory pay rolls dropped 44 percent.

If our price structure were again to get out of hand, the consequences would be far, far

worse. The amount of inflationary pressure in this country today is unbelievably great. If those forces are not firmly and courageously controlled, neither you nor I nor anyone else can estimate the chaos which could result.

The war in Europe today is a long way from being won. Those who are in a position to know, say that many months of hard fighting lie ahead of us. During those months we who are responsible for the control of prices and those who are responsible for production, both in our factories and on our farms, will be faced with problems that will be staggering.

But when the German war is won, we in the O. P. A. may be faced with problems which may be even greater—for, as I pointed out, it was after the armistice of 1918, that the greatest price increases occurred after World War No. 1. For this reason we must hold the price line firmly not only until V-day, but for sometime thereafter.

Many of us feel that the greatest inflationary threat will come from 4 to 7 months after the Germans finally give in. It will be then that the first consumer durable products come into the market in quantities far below the effective demand. It will be then that our workers will regain their confidence with jobs in peacetime industries. It will be then that our savings will come out of our banks and War bonds. It will be then that the terrible threat of an inventory boom will be most potent. In this period we shall all be called upon for our greatest efforts—if inflation is to be finally licked.

But there will come a time when supplies again begin to approximate demand. At that time price controls will be eliminated first from one field and then from another. I can assure you we are only too anxious for that day to come.

In the intervening months our task will be great. Without the vigorous support of farm groups, labor groups, our Congress, and the people in general, we in the O. P. A. cannot hope to accomplish our task. Without such support we will be swiftly swept aside and the flood gates of inflation will open.

In the struggle to maintain a stable price level our whole economic future may be at stake. If rents should start up, if food, clothing, and raw material prices should start up, the rise would gain in speed and soon be beyond our powers of control.

We would again face economic disaster and collapse—collapse from which our economy could recover only with great difficulty and after widespread suffering.

When the war is won our hearts are set on a new and vastly more prosperous America, with plenty of jobs at good wages, with good income for our farmers, with reasonable profits for our businessmen.

The world we live in, when the peace finally comes, will be an unsettled world—potentially a revolutionary world. If we in America are to know full security, full prosperity, and full opportunity, we must make our economic system work effectively and efficiently in the interest of all of us.

We must fully employ all our resources and all our manpower to raise our standards of living to provide good jobs, a good education, decent medical care, vastly improved housing, and a generally higher standard of living for every family in the land. If we fail to meet this test, our system will have failed. We will have failed and America will have failed. The price-control program, for which we in the O. P. A. are responsible, is a basic part of this fight for a finer, more prosperous, and more democratic America.

We will need your help, your understanding, and your support if we are to succeed in meeting our responsibilities in the difficult months that lie ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] secured for January 16 be transferred to January 18.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therein certain excerpts and statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said, and always truly, that our forefathers came to this new world seeking God, not gold. This Nation of ours is unique in that respect. So it is only natural that we should have put the eagle on our currency, both of coin and paper, referring to God's message to His first chosen people:

Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people.

Nor is it strange that the great seal of the United States should give ascendancy to the all-seeing eye, surrounded by a halo.

Nor is it surprising that the pillars of cloud and of fire should appear on our currency, and our coins carry the motto: "In God we trust."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Can the gentleman tell the Members when that emblem first appeared on any paper currency?

Mr. HOBBS. My impression is that it was after the report of that committee, which was composed, I think, of Franklin, Adams, and Jefferson. But I do not know when. I am sure the distinguished gentleman who knows so much more than I about such matters will recall.

Mr. WHITE. Were there any one dollar bills printed at that time, prior to the Civil War?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know, sir. I confess my ignorance and there is no need of an examination to prove it.

Mr. WHITE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am seeking information and not trying to display anybody's ignorance.

Mr. HOBBS. I recognize the distinguished gentleman is one of the eminent authorities on coinage and matters relating to money while I, an ignorant boy, know nothing about the subject.

Mr. WHITE. I confess to the gentleman that I do not know, and I am seeking information.

Mr. HOBBS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not know. I regret that I can be of no assistance in that regard. My point is that he is blind who cannot see in the history of our Nation, the leading of the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night and the hand of Almighty God as our infant Nation was brought to birth, then from babyhood through childhood, and the era when, under Him, the great Lincoln preserved the Union, and that same leadership has been manifest ever since. The challenge of the hour is that we fail it not. God will use us to work His will if we will let Him. The hour has struck when America at home should come to her knees in prayer, as a united Nation, in order that we may give thanks to Him, for His leadership, praying its continuance, and dedicating ourselves to follow that leadership in the world today and in the world tomorrow. All the churches are urging this. Many organizations have joined in the plea. The National Committee for Christian Leadership and the Breakfast Club groups and their associates have outlined the beginning of the prayer program.

The purpose of the announcement I am trying to make today is to call the attention of the Congress officially to the program for Washington, which will expand over the Nation, we are confident, that on the day after inauguration, January 21, a day of prayer be observed throughout the Nation in all the churches at their regular 11 o'clock services, a season of special prayer for the Government, and its civil and martial servants at home and abroad. For 400 years the great Roman Catholic Church has observed annually the red Mass, and offered special prayer for good government. There never has been a time when such prayer was needed more.

On the 22d there is to be a luncheon, and the theme of that luncheon is uniting to serve. Then on that night, the 22d, there will be a dedicatory dinner for Government officials and representatives of all the people, with the President of the United States, his Cabinet, the Supreme Court, the Members of Congress of both Houses, and the leaders in our departmental life in the Nation uniting for reconsecration and for dedication to the cause which is led by God.

Then on January 23 there is to be a joint meeting of breakfast groups, a luncheon for youth, and a great mass meeting, free and open to all, in the Departmental Auditorium, on the north side of Constitution Avenue between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets, where all those who will, may dedicate themselves in line with the thought of this program. Outstanding leaders will preside and speak at these meetings.

We Members of Congress are invited and urged to do our utmost to help assure the success of this great undertaking. Especially are we urged to be present in our respective churches on Sunday morning, January 21, at the dedicatory dinner, the evening of the 22d,

and at the mass meeting, the evening of the 23d.

Can we not dedicate ourselves anew, as we so often have in our private devotions, and join in concerted prayer for those who fight for God and for His peace, at home and abroad, and that He may give His world the solutions of the problems that press as never before?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CANCELATION OF RATION STAMPS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement and extracts from statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to have the opportunity of following the distinguished gentleman from Alabama because he touched on a moral issue which I think has an important relationship to the subject discussed by my colleague the gentleman from Texas, and also by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who addressed the House yesterday on the subject of the cancellation of ration stamps during the holidays. I thought after Mr. Bowles admitted he blundered in canceling the ration stamps the matter would be dropped. I note, however, that my colleagues from the majority have taken up the cudgels to justify the cancellation of ration stamps by Mr. Bowles, and therefore I feel constrained to make these remarks. Both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] have seen fit to call attention to a statement made by me on December 23, in which I charged that thrifty American housewives were being swindled and cheated when Mr. Bowles ordered the cancellation of sugar stamps and red and blue ration stamps. I have not changed my opinion as to the accuracy of the sentiment expressed by me.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] stated that the founders of our country ordered the inscription "in God we trust" to be placed on all silver and gold coins. I want to add that in addition to trusting in God the American people have also had trust and confidence in their Government. They have had trust and confidence in our Government's sacred obligation to keep our money good indefinitely and to honor and pay its bonds and other obligations. That is the kind of trust and confidence everyone must have in our Government, and no unwise or blundering act by any policy-making official must be permitted or tolerated that will shake the people's confidence in their Government. This is especially true at the present time, with our country engaged in a terrible war, and the need for complete unity being greater than ever before.

I regard, and Mr. Bowles agrees with me, that for food and other commodities under the rationing system, ration

stamps are a medium of legal tender. Without the necessary stamps, even though you possess all of the money in the world, unless you go into the black market, you cannot buy rationed food. And Mr. Bowles stated last year when about 85 percent of the food was taken off the ration list, and the number of red stamps were reduced from 60 points to 30 points a month, that the stamps would be good indefinitely. When Mr. Bowles announced that the ration stamps would be good indefinitely, the people had confidence in him as the policy-making official of our Government. He spoke for their Government, and they did not believe that any responsible official would engage in double talk. The people had a right to rely on the promise made by Mr. Bowles, and they trustingly believed him when he said their ration stamps would be good indefinitely.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield now.

Mr. PATMAN. May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact with reference to the matter of money that there are billions of dollars of paper money out now, on the face of which there is a statement "Payable on demand in gold." Well, the war came on and we cannot pay in gold, but nobody is losing confidence in the Government because we have these outstanding certificates which say, "Payable in gold" when we do not pay them in gold.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the Congress passed legislation that eliminated the necessity for paying them off in gold.

Mr. PATMAN. But we still have the promise there just as in this case. We have the promise.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that much of it could be paid in gold, for we did have close to \$23,000,000,000 worth of gold which has been reduced to \$20,500,000,000, and I am wondering where that \$2,000,000,000 worth of gold has gone to. I do not want to go into that question. I would rather not discuss that now, because I am trying to find out what happened to the \$2,000,000,000 worth of gold which we did have.

I am sorry to see politics injected into this discussion of the canceling of ration points. I think the gentleman from Texas and also the gentleman from California who spoke yesterday were trying to becloud the issues involved in the cancellation of ration stamps.

The gentleman from Texas diverted his discussion to a justification for the cancellation of ration stamps. In my opinion, the issue is one of integrity of a policy-making official, who speaks for our Government.

The question of food is not the primary issue, although with thousands of thrifty American housewives the matter of food was very essential. When Mr. Bowles canceled the unused ration stamps at Christmas, he forgot that a large majority of American housewives had skimped and saved on food so that there might be more for their loved ones in the battle lines, and also a few ration stamps left over for any emergency in

their family. They thought that when Mr. Bowles said the stamps were good indefinitely, they could rely on his promise.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I should like to add that the correspondence I have had with the women of my district and other sections of the country on the subject would indicate that they suffered no loss of food but resented the breach of faith.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And I believe that is the important question involved in this cancellation, a breach of faith on the part of an official representing the United States Government on a promise that he had made to the American people.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It was an express promise. When the Government asked the people to yield to rationing, the people did so graciously and gracefully. When the Government did that and said they would reduce their food stocks by a certain rationing program, that they would give the people stamps, the Government impliedly agreed that those stamps not only would be good as to length of time but that there would always be something there at the stores for them to get with the stamps. The people gave up about 50 percent of their supplies in many cases. When they did that the Government implied that there would be more food and sufficient food when they went to get it with their limited stamps.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to my remarks.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has informed us today that Mr. Bowles assumes full and exclusive responsibility for the cancellation of ration stamps. If that be the case, as I am inclined to believe, I want here and now to retract any statement made by me to the effect that Judge Fred Vinson, whom I regard as a very honorable and trustworthy public official, had anything to do with ordering the cancellation or repudiation of the unused ration stamps. I have served in this House with Judge Vinson and I know him to be a man of the highest character and integrity. I have read his order to Mr. Bowles, which led to the cancellation of ration stamps, and on the strength of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, that Mr. Bowles assumes full responsibility, I am pleased that Judge Vinson did not direct the methods to be used by the O. P. A. under the scheme announced by Mr. Bowles.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Since a conspiracy necessarily involves two people and the two people charged were Mr. Vinson and Mr. Bowles, and since the gentleman has

exonerated Mr. Vinson he necessarily must exonerate Mr. Bowles.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Texas himself in his own remarks said that Mr. Bowles took all blame for it, and I assume that he talks for Mr. Bowles.

Mr. PATMAN. I said I would not pass it over to anybody else, I would just speak for Mr. Bowles.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So Mr. Bowles assumes it. But in a letter to me he said it was unfortunate, it was—

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken; he said it was unfortunate they did not anticipate these things.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; they could not anticipate them; that is true. But I recall that on this floor on May 5 I made a speech. It will be recalled that about May 3, 85 percent of the meat that was under rationing was put on the free list. A few days thereafter I made a speech in which I predicted that there would be many other things taken off rationing, including canned goods; and later in the summer approximately 85 percent of all rationed foods were put on the free list.

That was not done by Mr. Bowles. He said on May 8:

I do not think we can look forward to any broad slackening of our canned-goods rationing program during the next 12 months.

I am quoting from an article that appeared in Collier's magazine for May 8, written by Mr. Bowles in which he said there would not be much relief in rationing until 1945, or until after the war in Europe is over.

At that time I asked the question, Who ordered Mr. Bowles to put 85 percent of the food on the free list? and to this day I have not found out. I am wondering if it was the same person or the same group who recently ordered Mr. Bowles to cancel the rationing stamps.

I went further in my remarks on May 5. Of course, there was not anything political in my remarks. I did suggest, though, that 85 percent of our food was put on the free list because of the impending Presidential election. It was a matter of timing and purely coincidental that it took place a few months before the election was to take place.

I predicted in that speech:

Personally, I am convinced that should the New Deal elect its fourth-term candidate on November 7, the O. P. A. will shortly thereafter reinstate and make more drastic all rationing policies to further regiment and socialize the economy of our country.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it is worthy of attention of the entire Nation that the gentleman's prophecy was so accurate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; it was rather accurate, but the trouble is I did not prophesy enough. I could not foresee that they were going to cancel the rationing stamps that Mr. Bowles said would be good indefinitely. I just could not look that far into the future. At the best, who could predict that an official would break his word with the

people? In my opinion, this matter of cancellation of rationing stamps was something that came up just around Christmas time as a sort of extra present to the American people.

Speaking about food shortages, the farmers of this country have produced the largest food crop in the history of our country, so that the supply of grain, meat, poultry, milk, and so forth, is abundant. We are committed, and gladly committed, to take care of our troops and of our allies, as well as to help those people in destitute countries that need our assistance so far as food is concerned. We want to meet those commitments. The commitments, of course, to our soldiers come first, whether we have any food at all.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. Does not the gentleman feel that we are rather fortunate in this Nation to have had such a wonderful agricultural program directed in the beginning by that great Secretary of Agriculture, HENRY A. WALLACE?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I cannot comment too favorably on that. I recollect Mr. WALLACE was the one who began the scarcity-of-production program. Last year, 1944, was the first year when the restrictions were taken off of all production and the farmers were permitted to go ahead and produce everything they could for the American people.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Personally, I cannot give credit for any great wisdom so far as the powers that be are concerned, especially the O. P. A., that sets a price on butter at such a low point that myself and millions of other farmers are unable to feed their cows in order to produce the butter that everybody today is crying for.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman brought up the question of butter because a good many people are wondering why they are not able to get butter. I want to tell them the reason, because it is important. You know we produce a lot of butter in Minnesota, but we are not going to produce as much butter this year as we did before. A governmental agency, the O. P. A.—Mr. Bowles, if you please—has fixed the price of cream that goes into butter at 7 cents a pound lower than the cream that goes into fluid milk, not used for butter. As a consequence, the refusal to equalize the price has caused the dairy farmers of this country to sell their fluid milk, and we are going to have a decided decrease in the production of butter, and the people of the country will not get it. The decrease in butter production is definitely due to an O. P. A. policy, and the people should know it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if in the production of food any consideration should be given to the possibility of a crop failure. We have been blessed in this country with ideal growing conditions for the production of food. Is that not true?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true.

Mr. O'HARA. If we keep on with the farm-help draft situation, and the farm manpower situation, and the taking of our farm help, what is going to happen to the production of food?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Speaking of dairying in particular, there are 28,000,000 dairy cows in the United States. Of course, they do not milk themselves. It is no glamour to milk a cow twice a day, and certainly it is no adventure after the first time. It takes skilled labor to milk those cows. It takes labor to feed them. It takes labor to raise them. Here we have a new directive from the Administration which proposes to take a very substantial share of the essential labor now engaged in the dairy and other farms of the country. May I say to my colleague from Minnesota and other Members of the House that as the result of the new directive putting the essential farm workers into the military service we will find a decided decrease in the production of dairy and other food products. We will also find that thousands of farmers throughout the United States will be forced to decrease their production and, yes, I will say, there will be thousands of them who will sell their herds and quit farming because of inability to get labor.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it would be interesting if the gentleman would ascertain from the gentleman from Michigan whether or not the program which has been put into effect by O. P. A. and the War Food Administration to force reduced rates on livestock comes from that great scarcity program put in by that former Secretary of Agriculture, WALLACE. Is that a hang-over from the old days?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It must be a hang-over from the old days.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Just as the gentleman and I and every other American give credit to the fine, patriotic laboring men of this Nation for the wonderful production that we have had in producing munitions and everything else to wage a successful war, so do we, you and I and every other American, give the farmers, the men who till the soil, credit for the production on the farm. We do not give Sidney Hillman, or Earl Browder, or Harry Bridges or anybody else who tries to speak for labor credit for the fine production records that the laboring men have made, nor do we give any other political seat warmer credit for the fine production the farmers have made. Does the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I think that will answer the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, whom I respect, but nevertheless he is like a lot of the other gentlemen on that side. They go off on a tantrum and they forget fundamentals. They are idealists instead of realists, and if there was ever a time when we should get down to realism it is today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, I might say I would be happy to speak for myself. I am only too happy to get advice from the other side of the aisle but I do not like them speaking for me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope the gentleman can speak in his own time one of these days. But I have stated repeatedly when we have had discussions with reference to the O. P. A., I think most Americans favor price control and are against inflation and want reasonable and businesslike measures passed here as well as a businesslike administration of the laws according to the intent of the Congress. But as a matter of fact the O. P. A. cannot operate unless there is a scarcity. They must have a scarcity in order to have rationing, and therefore it appears to me that they purposely seek to create scarcities. May I illustrate?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The O. P. A. does not ration. The W. P. B. does the rationing; I mean, they order it. The O. P. A. only administers it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to have that contribution.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. What the gentleman says is correct. The power comes from the W. P. B., but the power by Executive order was delegated to the O. P. A., and the O. P. A. does the job. W. P. B. does not have a thing to do with it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman. Here is the way they tell us it should operate with reference to food supplies. It is said that the War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, is supposed to tell the O. P. A. how much food they are to ration among the people. In this instance when they came to canceling the ration stamps, I am satisfied that the O. P. A. bypassed the W. F. A. in reaching its decision.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to continue, following out the statement I made that O. P. A. must have a scarcity in order to operate, that we have a short-

age of pork at the present time, a decided shortage. What is the reason for it? In 1942 we also had a shortage of pork. The farmers of this country raised 105,000,000 pigs in 1942, but there was a shortage of the supplies we needed and the price went up and we had to have strict rationing of pork. So in the fall of 1942 the War Food Administration urged farmers to increase their hog production by 20 percent. The farmers did. They raised their hog production in 1943 from 105,000,000 head to 127,000,000 head, and we had an abundance; in fact, we had so much pork and so many hogs that the market was glutted. They took off the rationing, and the people got all of the pork they needed, and we had enough for our allies and for the armed forces. The O. P. A. could not function with an abundance, so someone conceived the idea that the farmers should cut their production of hogs for 1944 by 20 percent, and the way they forced it down was to pull the support price out from under certain weight hogs, and the farmers did not raise as many hogs in 1944. They reduced their production not by 20 percent but by 34 percent, because the Government failed to keep its promise in supporting the price.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So we have a scarcity this year. It is my hope that we can have a consistent program that will assure an abundance of production of all kinds of foods in 1945, which are so necessary to carry on this war. If they would let the War Food Administrator handle production and rationing and the prices of farm products as a single administrator, we would not have the difficulties we are up against today and there would not have been any cancellation of ration stamps.

In conclusion, may I point out that the question of food in connection with this cancellation of stamps is not the important item with me, it is the word of my Government. A competent policymaking official who is in charge said that these ration stamps would be good indefinitely. Indefinitely, bear in mind. The thrifty American housewives had a right to rely on the word from a policymaking Government official. He represented the Government, and his word should have been as good as a Government bond. We must have complete honesty on the part of administration officials placed in charge of our Government, both before and after election. Breaking of promises made to the people can only lead to loss of confidence, and again I say our Government, which needs full confidence from all of the people, must have it now if we are to win this war and retain our American form of government.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman read the news report from New York which stated that Mr. Bowles at a meeting in that city had said he had made a mistake in issuing the rationing order and canceling these stamps.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That was mentioned here today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That he had misjudged the number of people affected, in other words, taking the position that the error was not in canceling the stamps but in simply misjudging the number of people affected, that if there had been a smaller minority affected it would not have been a mistake.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is correct, as far as I am able to determine, although it is denied here today that he had any such intent in mind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And that it is all right to invade the rights of a minority, as long as the minority is small enough.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want the Members of the House to read the following news item which appeared in this week's issue of Labor, in which it should be noted that Mr. Bowles frankly confessed that he blundered when he canceled the unused ration stamps during the Christmas festivities in 1944:

O. P. A. CHIEF BOWLES SAYS HE BLUNDERED

Frank confession was made this week by O. P. A. Administrator Chester Bowles that he blundered in canceling unused sugar and red and blue point ration stamps.

The order which dropped like a bombshell during Christmas festivities, was the result of mistaken conclusions drawn from a preliminary survey of housewives, Bowles said.

However, he added that it is too late to rectify the mistake, contending that would work a hardship on a majority of the people.

Bowles made his admission in a speech at New York after the cancellation had been bitterly criticized in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STATEMENT OF POLICY BY UNITED STATES CONGRESS APPROVING ATLANTIC CHARTER

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1943, during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I introduced a resolution to place the Congress of the United States on record as approving the now famous Atlantic Charter. Last Tuesday, January 9, I reintroduced this measure which is now House Concurrent Resolution 16 and reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President accurately stated the principles in the national policy of the United States in the joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, which principles are

applicable on a world-wide basis and are as follows:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned;

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth. They will endeavor with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great and small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance; and

Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

This resolution has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I hope the committee will soon hold hearings on the measure and report it favorably so that the representatives of the people will have an opportunity to express themselves in respect to this most significant document.

Throughout the country there is a deep and growing interest concerning the Atlantic Charter. When it was announced to the world, liberty-loving nations all over the globe were infused with new hope. The charter is a statement of ends to be sought, of objectives we are trying to realize, of ideals which we hope to reach. Every conceivable step to make these ideals possible of achievement should immediately be taken.

I feel that congressional endorsement of the Atlantic Charter would be most helpful. An official expression of the Congress on these principles would strengthen our position in world affairs. It would add the moral support of the legislative branch of the Government to the position already taken by the executive department. The Congress should take an increasingly active part in developing a foreign policy to guide the Republic in this period of universal upheaval.

Congressional approval of the Atlantic Charter would show the people that their chosen representatives believe in

the principles contained therein; it would, in my opinion, increase the power of our voice in international affairs; it would be an excellent move in helping to shape an enlightened foreign policy and it would be an announcement to all the world that this, the greatest legislature on earth, has wholeheartedly given its sanction to the charter which has generated so much hope among the peoples of this earth.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say I think the tenor of the gentleman's speech is 100 percent correct. I think he has made a great contribution by putting in this resolution and I for one will be glad to support it.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to compliment my colleague. I think if we are going to have peace we have to have a moral foundation for that peace and we can find it in no other place than in some declaration of principles. I commend the gentleman for reintroducing this measure.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his kind statement.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Does the gentleman feel that if his resolution is adopted by the Congress it will assure a correct observance of the principles of the Atlantic Charter by our executive authorities?

Mr. MERROW. I believe it will help greatly.

Mr. HALE. Is the gentleman disturbed by what is happening to the Atlantic Charter today?

Mr. MERROW. I am much disturbed; and I hope this subject may be debated in both this House and the other body and that we may have congressional expression concerning the principles set forth in this declaration.

Mr. HALE. Does not the gentleman feel that much more could be done by this Government than is being done to procure observance of the principles of the Charter?

Mr. MERROW. I do.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. In referring to the Atlantic Charter as something in existence, I take it the gentleman has reference to the Presidential message to the Congress presented on August 21, 1941, in which was included the purported document which purported to be signed by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt. Is that the Atlantic Charter to which the gentleman refers or the one the President referred to in the recent press conference?

Mr. MERROW. The Atlantic Charter that is contained in Document 358, to which the gentleman has referred, is the one I have in mind. This was contained in a message sent by the President to the

Congress and was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was signed by the President and signed by Mr. Churchill as the gentleman has stated. That is the Atlantic Charter to which I have reference, and it is the charter which I read here this afternoon.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman has in mind that at the press conference indicated it was stated that there was no document as such signed by the representatives of the different countries. Did the gentleman understand that from the press conference?

Mr. MERROW. That is what I inferred from the press conference. The fact is that the message which was sent up here by the President on August 21, 1941, contains the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. FELLOWS. And shows that it was signed?

Mr. MERROW. And shows that it was signed; yes. The word "Signed" is here in front of the President's name and in front of Mr. Churchill's name.

Mr. HALE. Is it not a fact that in January 1942 following the signature of the Charter in August it was agreed to and formed the basis of a treaty by the several United Nations?

Mr. MERROW. It was not a treaty, but it was incorporated in the declaration that the United Nations signed. As yet no legislative body has placed its approval on the Atlantic Charter. I feel therefore it would be most helpful if the Congress would debate this matter and place its stamp of approval upon the Atlantic Charter. I believe that would be a step in helping develop our foreign policy.

Mr. HORAN. In other words the gentleman would have the House ratify it, in a manner of speaking.

Mr. MERROW. I mean that the House should approve it, that the House by adopting my resolution should say that it is the sense of the House that the President accurately stated the principles in the national policy of the United States in the Atlantic Charter. It cannot be ratified in the sense that the Senate ratifies treaties unless it is presented as a treaty; but if we go on record as approving the principles we certainly will give the Atlantic Charter great moral support.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point House Document 353:

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING A PUBLIC STATEMENT MADE BY BOTH PRIME MINISTER OF ENGLAND AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WITH REGARD TO THE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES NECESSARY UNDER THE CODE OF THE TWO COUNTRIES

To the Congress of the United States:

Over a week ago I held several important conferences at sea with the British Prime Minister. Because of the factor of safety to British, Canadian, and American ships, and their personnel, no prior announcement of these meetings could properly be made.

At the close, a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made.

I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

"The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lease-Lend Act, for the armed forces of the United States, and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression, has been further examined.

"Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encour-

age all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

"(Signed) WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined, through the Lend-Lease Act, on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which east and west are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany.

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to nazi-ism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia, to the American Hemisphere itself.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes, of necessity, the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 21, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the question which was asked of me was answered by another Member I ask unanimous consent at this time to proceed for 5 minutes in order to give my own answer to a question that was directed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, in 1932 and 1933 the agricultural structure of this Nation had reached its lowest level. Farmers were in bankruptcy, and low farm prices had destroyed the farmers' market. Then came the Democratic administration—the New Deal if you please. The agricultural program was headed by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, as Secretary of Agriculture. During his administration the foundation was laid and a program was built to the point that today the farmer enjoys the highest prices in the history of this Nation and the production of food and fiber has been the highest in history.

This was followed up ably by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard.

It brought the farmer to the point where he actually enjoys the fruits of his labor. The great soil-conservation program, among other things in the agricultural program, was enacted. The A. A. A. has really done a good job. Then came the war, and, thank God, we had that program. Thank God, the farmers

were, with the help of the Department of Agriculture, in a position where they could grow two blades of grass where one grew before and the greatest production of food and fiber resulted. We are now in a position to meet the demands that are made upon us on account of the war.

I am just wondering when we are going to get a Price Administrator who will not be criticized. The O. P. A. has not always done a perfect job, but it, together with the War Food Administration, by virtue of and in cooperation with labor, agriculture, and government, has furnished to our armed forces the food and fiber which is needed. What position would we have been in if we had to meet that crisis with agriculture in the condition it was in during 1932? Again I say, thank God for the program that was given the American people by the Democratic Party with, yes, the help of some fine Republicans on the Agricultural Committee which I had the honor to serve on for 8 years. They cooperated with us and we with them. With the advice of the Secretary of Agriculture and the assistance of the Department of Agriculture the program was perfected and put in working order.

Much has been said about rationing stamps. I do not believe that I know and I do not believe that any Member of this House will attempt to take the floor here and say that any person in this Nation has gone hungry. That is the test of whether the program is successful or not and as long as they keep the food and fiber going to our armed forces and to the men who are valiantly toiling on our farms, in our factories, mills, and mines, we will go on to victory. That program has not broken down yet, and, thank God with good administration it will not break down. It will be the one vehicle upon which we will ride on to victory along with our armed forces.

Oh, they try consistently to read into the minds of the American people the fact that any man who stands up and fights for the cause of humanity, for the cause of labor, is supposed to be a subversive individual. I thank God for the labor leaders of this Nation and the great job that the labor organizations have done in order to bring the help that is necessary in getting the guns and supplies to the boys across the seas. All real Americans praise the labor leaders and especially the C. I. O. for the outstanding work they have performed. Organized labor is doing its job and doing it well. I say to those who criticize and try to distort the facts that America needs the help of our great labor leaders. Do not criticize in this time of crisis because if you do you are hurting and hindering the war effort. No American should smear for political reasons. Your duty to America is to cooperate in the interest of humanity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks previously made on the Atlantic Charter, I ask

unanimous consent to include House Document No. 358, a statement by the Prime Minister of England and the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUFFETT, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HEDRICK (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), for 1 legislative day, January 15, 1945, on account of official business.

To Mr. BAILEY (at the request of Mr. HEDRICK), for 3 legislative days, beginning January 15 and including January 18, 1945, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

103. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of James M. Hiller; to the Committee on Claims.

104. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

105. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the thirtieth annual report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura May Ryan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 1394. A bill for the relief of William H. W. Komp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY:

H. R. 1395. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary Alice Borden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1396. A bill for the relief of Anne Loacker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 1397. A bill to provide for awarding an appropriate medal and citation to Harvard Merrill Hodgins, of Hancock Point, Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1398. A bill granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Swope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Palmisano and the legal guardian of Anthony Palmisano, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Louis T. Klauder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Frank Franklin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1402. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1403. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Margaret Hockenberry, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 1404. A bill for the relief of B. H. Matthies; to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1392. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Acts, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 1393. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 1394. A bill to encourage full private employment during the post-war period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1395. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1396. A bill for the relief of officers of the Army who were members of the first two classes at Civil Affairs Training School, University of Chicago; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1397. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a Military Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1398. A bill to reduce immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1399. A bill providing for the designation of certain Mondays during the present war as Memory Monday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 1370. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1371. A bill providing for an additional Naval Academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1372. A bill providing for an additional Military Academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1373. A bill to provide for the construction of a marine hospital in or near Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 1374. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 1375. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 1376 (by request). A bill providing compensation for time required in training services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1377 (by request). A bill providing uniforms for Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 1378 (by request). A bill defraying traveling expenses of transferred employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1379. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1380. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 1381. A bill referring the claims of the Turtle Mountain Band or Bands of Chipewia Indians of North Dakota to the Court of Claims for adjudication and settlement; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1382. A bill authorizing payment to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians for certain lands ceded by them to the United States by a treaty of July 23, 1851; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1383. A bill providing that certain real property, together with improvements thereon acquired for military purposes or for national parks or monuments, shall not be exempt from taxation by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1384. A bill to establish an additional United States military academy at Muskogee, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 1385. A bill concerning seeing-eye dogs on trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 1386. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANCOCK:

H. R. 1387. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before the courts, departments, and offices of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1388. A bill relating to the posthumous award of the decoration of the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 1389. A bill providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 1390. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co., a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1391. A bill to establish a Department of National Health, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 1392. A bill for the purpose of renewing and increasing forage and improving watershed conditions on range lands, forests or Indian lands, or other public owned and controlled land of the United States; authorizing the sowing operations by airplane, machinery, or other means, for conducting experiments to improve methods of reseeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONROE:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 15, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of the morning, who spreadest the mantle of light about us while other lands are shrouded in shadow, yet who dost brood with watchful love in both darkness and light, grant us a vivid sense of Thy presence as here we face the tangled tragedy of this sorely wounded world. As dawn has grown into fullness of noontide, so let Thy light banish all shadows of doubt and guilt from our own hearts that we may find and follow Thy purpose throughout this day. We beseech Thee help us to use its precious hours in such manner that Thou canst hallow it with Thy blessing and glorify it with Thy presence.

May we be strong to do the things worth doing and put aside the things which are unworthy, belittling, or base. Keep our expectant eyes on the unending future toward which we strive. Give us the radiant joy which is the constant reward of those who are workers together with Thee for a redeemed earth to which Thy kingdom at last shall come. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

ALBERT W. HAWKES, a Senator from the State of New Jersey; JAMES M. MEAD, a Senator from the State of New York; E. H. MOORE, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma; and W. LEE O'DANIEL, a Senator from the State of Texas, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 11, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR TRUMAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate copy of a letter of resignation

from Mr. TRUMAN addressed to the Governor of Missouri, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,

Washington, D. C., January 9, 1945.

Hon. PHIL M. DONNELLY,

Governor, State of Missouri,

Jefferson City, Mo.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Due to the fact I am to be sworn in as Vice President of the United States on January 20, I am tendering my resignation as United States Senator from Missouri, effective January 18.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN,

United States Senator.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING WITH GENERAL MARSHALL AND ADMIRAL KING

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am glad to announce to the Members of the Senate that they, together with Members of the House of Representatives, will soon be invited by the Secretaries of War and Navy to attend an off-the-record discussion on the present war situation, which will be presented by General Marshall on behalf of the War Department and the Army, and Admiral King on behalf of the Navy Department and the Navy.

For reasons of security, the information which will be given to the Members of Congress at this meeting will be highly confidential. The place of the meeting cannot yet be disclosed. However, it will be held on the morning of Wednesday, January 24, at a place which will be convenient to all of us to attend. I understand that each Member of the Senate is to receive a formal invitation, which will contain complete details.

I have been asked to emphasize that only Members of Congress will be permitted to attend. Members of their staffs, or friends, or individuals acting on behalf of the Members, will not be admitted.

I understand that General Marshall and Admiral King will give us information on the war which cannot be released publicly for security reasons. I strongly recommend that all of us attend who possibly can, because such information directly from General Marshall and Admiral King, who have such a profound knowledge of present and pending military and naval operations, should give us all a much better understanding of the enormously important developments taking place today.

Again I must emphasize that the information presented at this meeting will be confidential, and that only Members of Congress will be permitted to attend. The date, I again state, will be the morning of the 24th of January. The exact time of the meeting will be stated in the invitation which we will all receive, and I hope that all the Members of the Senate who possibly can do so will attend.

Many of us will remember a former occasion when General Marshall and Admiral King gave to Members of the Senate on one day, and on another, I think, to Members of the House, a confidential description of the situation up to that time. I am sure we will all be very much interested in and instructed by this confidential recital on their part of the present military and naval situation.